DE GRUYTER

Marek Winiarczyk

DIAGORAS OF MELOS

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT ATHEISM

BEITRÄGE ZUR ALTERTUMSKUNDE

Marek Winiarczyk
Diagoras of Melos

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen und Clemens Zintzen

Band 350

Marek Winiarczyk

Diagoras of Melos

A Contribution to the History of Ancient Atheism

Translated from Polish by
Witold Zbirohowski-Kościa

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-044377-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-044804-7
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-044765-1
ISSN 1616-0452

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

In memoriam
Georgii Łanowski (1919–2000)
Herberti Myśliwiec (1926–1998)
Mariani Plezia (1917–1996)

Preface

Diagoras of Melos was a second-rate lyric poet who would have probably been ignored in antiquity let alone modern times if he had not become famous in Athens for a quite different reason. There he criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries and discouraged people from initiation. That is why in the 420s he gained a reputation for impiety. Later ancient tradition portrayed him as a typical atheist and the author of an atheistic book. He frequently appears in the catalogues of atheists, and Hellenistic biographers ascribed to him various anecdotes to illustrate his impious views. This opinion means that the poet from Melos is not only of interest to historians of literature, but also to historians of religion and philosophy, who try to determine whether he was indeed the first radical atheist to completely deny the existence of gods. Over the last several centuries a relatively large number of articles and books, of diverse quality, have been written on Diagoras. Virtually every aspect of this subject has been disputed, from the dates and key events in his life to his work and views. Scholars have discussed whether Diagoras was only a lyric poet or perhaps also a philosopher advocating atheistic views. Some have even devised an erroneous theory that there were two different persons named Diagoras: a pious poet and an atheist philosopher.

In my book I try to reconstruct the life and work of Diagoras, but I fully realise that much of what I say will be hypothetical. Unfortunately, this is unavoidable, since there are very few reliable testimonies and some can be interpreted in various ways. I try to show that sometimes it is impossible to verify or disprove a testimonium, and that is why some problems will never be conclusively resolved. For this reason, I am deeply convinced that no one can peremptorily state that they know the whole truth about Diagoras, though some hypotheses certainly seem more convincing than others. I feel that scholars studying Diagoras should remember the words of Xenophanes of Colophon ($6^{th}/5^{th}$ century BC). In a fragment passed on by Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. math.* VII 110) he says that people have various opinions on the gods but we never know which one is correct. If some theological concept were indeed true, even the author would not know it, because 'opinion is wrought over all' (δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται).[1]

---

1 DK 21 B 34. Translation in Graham, *The Texts* ((2010) 127

'Now the plain truth no man has seen nor will any
know concerning the gods and what I have said concerning all things.
For even if he should completely succeed in describing things as they come to pass
nonetheless he himself does not: opinion is wrought over all.'

Various interpretations of this Xenophanes fragment are discussed by Lesher, *Xenophanes* (1992), 159–169.

I hope this book will become a solid basis for further studies on account of the fact that I have extensively researched literature in eight languages, honestly presented the views of other researchers and critically reviewed their hypotheses. I also hope this monograph will encourage the reader to reflect on the problem of 'atheism' in ancient Greece. Above all the scholar should know that the words ἀθεότης and ἄθεος have many meanings and that the accusation of atheism was often used to discredit people. Such was the case already in ancient times, but also in modern times, especially in the 17th and 18th centuries. Scientific integrity requires us to define this concept accurately and not use it for non-scientific purposes. This will help us avoid unnecessary polemics.

I treat this monograph of Diagoras as a case study. I focus on the methodological issues and try to show how complex problems should be treated in a scientific way, free of any ideological considerations. Below are several rules which in my opinion apply to the scientific approach. Ones I feel should be followed by every genuine scholar.

1. One should be aware that the views expressed by modern scholars of antiquity have diverse values.

– Many statements are based on good sources and incontrovertible.
– Some views seem probable because they are supported by ancient testimonia, but their information is contradicted by the testimonia of other ancient authors. In such cases scholars divide into groups, each overly stressing the value of one testimonium and undermining the value of another. The arguments used by supporters of contradictory hypotheses can never be conclusive. Therefore it is better to concede that the given controversy cannot be convincingly resolved, and opting for one view or the other would be subjective. I believe that in such situations it is better to admit to our lack of knowledge in this matter, *ignoramus et ignorabimus*, than support a hypothesis that can never be convincingly proved. Naturally, every scholar has the right to speak in favour of a hypothesis that seems more probable, but that person has to appreciate that it is their subjective opinion. In a scientific work one needs to clearly distinguish between what is certain and what is only probable.
– Scholars sometimes propose hypotheses that are not supported by any ancient testimonia. We are then dealing with arbitrary speculation that is later repeated by others, especially if the author of the hypothesis is a very renowned scholar. Nor should we succumb to fashionable ideas that are conventional wisdom for a time until they turn out to be wrong and are rejected. For example, for several centuries it was considered certain that Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ ἀναγραφή had been translated in verse by Ennius at the start of the 2nd century BC. It was not until the first half of the 20th century that scholars

noticed that prosaic fragments of the work *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia* cited in Lactantius' *Divinae institutiones*, revealed the characteristics of archaic Latin prose. Now it is widely recognised that Ennius' translation was prosaic.[2] It turns out that a view held by the majority or even all scholars in a given epoch might not actually be true. Therefore, we should study sources independently (*suo Marte*) and treat scientific literature critically so as not to be swayed by academic authorities and scientific trends.

2. One cannot *a priori* suppose information passed on by a single ancient source is necessarily false or that it can only be considered true if it is confirmed by another testimonium. For example, we know that Ἱστορίαι by Duris of Samos (c. 340–270 BC) includes a lot of misleading information, which is why many scholars treated as fictitious its claim that the Spartan admiral Lysander was worshipped like a god and that his cult was established on the Island of Samos in 404/403. Considered particularly untrue was the idea that games in honour of the goddess Hera (the *Heraia*) were renamed the *Lysandreia*. Yet in 1964 German archaeologists found the base of a statue of a victor of games devoted to Lysander. An accidentally found inscription verified Duris' testimony and settled a longstanding academic dispute.[3] Similarly to the work of Duris, the *Bibliotheca historica* of Diodorus Siculus (1st century BC) includes incorrect information. And here, too, some scholars automatically reject information provided by this historian when it does not suit their particular hypothesis. This subject I deal with in chapter II.

   On the other hand, we should not uncritically accept information, for instance in scholia, when it is evidently wrong or of dubious value. Then again, it is also wrong to arbitrarily reject what the scholia say simply because it contradicts a given hypothesis. Each piece of information in scholia should be examined in detail and verified or disproved (see chap. II below).

3. The approach to certain issues (e.g. those of atheism or impiety trials) is sometimes determined by personal philosophical, religious or political views. If someone maintains that in ancient Greece there existed atheists, this has ideological implications and is sometimes used, albeit often in a very discreet way, for non-scientific purposes. A similar problem is faced by scholars who consider Athenian democracy to be a precursor of liberal Western democracy.[4] That is why some scholars question testimonia that

2 Winiarczyk, *The Sacred History* (2013), 115–118.

3 Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 48–49.

4 A good review of literature published in the last quarter of the 20th century is found in Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 369–371 ('Zur Bewertung der athenischen Demokratie'); *idem*, *Fear* (2014), 159–163.

speak of impiety trials in 5th-century Athens and cast doubt on the historicity of the ψήφισμα of Diopeithes[5] because these contradict their belief in ancient Athens as the cradle of freedom and democracy where impiety trials could not happen. In their opinion, the trial of Socrates was an exception to the rule. Other scholars, in turn, support the view popularised by Eric Robertson Dodds (1893–1979), according to which in the second half of the 5th century BC there occurred a radical conservative reaction to preserve religious traditions, and this led to a series of trials against impiety.[6] In my opinion, both extreme standpoints are wrong, and the truth, as usual, is somewhere in between. Many scholars also make the error of exclusively looking for political reasons to explain impiety trials and *a priori* rejecting the possibility of genuine religious motives. I think that such an attitude is preconditioned, more often than not inadvertently, by the scholar's personal worldview. For some it is difficult to accept that religion could be the driving force behind the actions of Athenians in their 'age of enlightenment'. And yet the polis was a religious and political community. Therefore, if someone was considered an atheist (ἀσεβής, ἄθεος), that person was seen as a threat to the whole community. There was a widely held conviction that someone who was an atheist angered the gods, and in punishing such an offender they could also harm those living close to him.[7] Moreover, it was believed that cursed people physically carried a miasma (μίασμα, *contagium*). Therefore, the author and his book containing impious/atheistic views could infect the entire community.[8] Putting a godless person on trial and condemning that person to death or expulsion was evidence that the inhabitants of Athens did not share the views of someone cursed by the gods and that they wished to divert the wrath of the gods.[9] We should also note that some accusations of impiety occurred during the Peloponnesian War or soon after its end, when religious emotions were especially tense.

4. We should never delude ourselves that several not especially convincing 'arguments' are enough to justify a hypothesis. A single serious argu-

5 Thus, for example in: Dover, *The Freedom of the Intellectual* (1975), 24–54, reprint in: *idem*, *The Greeks and Their Legacy* (1988), 135–158; Wallace, *Private Lives* (1994), 127–155; Raaflaub, *Den Olympier herausfordern?* (2000), 96–113, 266–270; Filonik, *Athenian Impiety Trials* (2013), 11–96.

6 Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1956), 179–206. Similarly Janko (see chap. V).

7 See Appendix III.

8 See Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales* (1992), 46–50; Parker, *Miasma* (1996), 144–190; Burkert, *Kulte des Altertums* (1998), 149–156.

9 See Speyer, *Fluch* (1969), 1180–1191, esp. 1184 ff. ('Beseitigung und Sühnung'); idem, *Büchervernichtung* (1981), 5–6, 30–36, 55–56; Powell, *Athens and Sparta* (2001), 407.

ment always carries more weight than many pseudo-arguments. It is worth remembering the ninth philological commandment formulated by Karl Lehrs (1802–1878) in his letter to Christian August Lobeck (1781–1860) of 7.03.1873: *Du sollst nicht glauben, dass zehn schlechte Gründe gleich sind einem guten* ('You should not believe that ten bad reasons are worth as much as one good reason').[10] For example, I once tried to prove that scholars were wrong to connect the cult of the sun in Alexarchus' Uranopolis with the works of Euhemerus and Iambulus, which speak of the cult of heavenly bodies.[11]

5. We should realise that writers in antiquity often subjectively interpreted historical events. They gave biased appraisals of the actions of people and the value of the works of other authors on account of their personal political, philosophical or literary sympathies. That is why today's scholars should first try to determine why a particular appraisal should be negative or positive and not accept the ancient author's opinion at face value. I admit that this is sometimes very difficult, and in particular cases even impossible.
6. A great weakness of many works is the author's failure to define the concepts they use. This is particularly apparent in the case of Diagoras. Some scholars consider him to have been an atheist, while others deny this claim. Yet generally they fail to clearly define the term atheism, which has many meanings. I discuss this problem in detail in chapter IV. Likewise, the concept of 'utopia' is variously understood, which often leads to pointless polemics between scholars using the same term but talking about different phenomena.[12]
7. Many scholars limit their studies of a subject to literature that has appeared after the Second World War, erroneously assuming that older works are outdated. In fact many views expressed in the late 20th and early 21st century are already found in books published in the 19th century or even in old prints from the 17th–18th centuries. It seems to me that scholars should try to determine who first proposed a given hypothesis or conjecture.[13] That is why I deeply object to the citation of exclusively the latest works, since these all too frequently merely repeat what has already been considered before without contributing anything new to our knowledge.

10 Lehrs, *Zehngebote* (1902), 476. Also see Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung* (1972), 142 'Für die Unechtheit des Prometheus hat niemand ein durchschlagendes Argument vorgebracht und den Satz, daß sich ein paar Dutzend schwacher Gründe nie zu einem starken summieren lassen, sollte man nie vergessen.'

11 Winiarczyk, *Die hellenistischen Utopien* (2011), 213–214 with n. 58.

12 On the definition of 'utopia', see Winiarczyk, *op.cit.*, 4–12.

13 Therefore I cannot accept the standpoint of Dover, *Aristophanes, Clouds* (1968), VIII–IX.

Scholars of ancient philosophy, religion, medicine and science should also take into account oriental traditions, such as texts in the Arabic, Syriac, Hebrew, Aramaic and Coptic languages. Naturally, one may use translations or the help of orientalists, since classical philologists and ancient history scholars are rarely fluent in oriental languages. On Diagoras in Arabic sources, see chapter II 8, below.

8. It is impermissible to cite an ancient source from a secondary work or an outdated edition. One should try to use the best possible edition and sometimes even confront two good editions. At the end of the book one should list the editions used. It is only then that we are able to assess the way of work and competence of the ancient history scholar.

Thanks to a sabbatical leave granted to me by the Rector of the University of Wrocław, this book was written in the academic year of 2013/2014, during which I conducted research in London, Munich and Rome. I would like to thank the Dean of the Faculty of Historical and Pedagogical Sciences at the University of Wrocław for the financing of the translation of my book.

I hope this monograph will be of interest to historians of religion and philosophy, classical philologists and ancient history scholars. I dedicate it to the memory of the late professors of the University of Wrocław Jerzy Łanowski and Herbert Myśliwiec as well as the late Professor Marian Plezia of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Kraków, who so kindly supported me in my academic *cursus honorum*.

Wrocław, February 2016 Marek Winiarczyk

Contents

Abbreviations —— XV

I. Current State of Research —— 1

II. Analysis of the More Important Sources —— 7

1. Hermippus —— 7
2. The comedies of Aristophanes —— 8
   A. *The Clouds* —— 8
   B. *The Birds* —— 12
   C. *The Frogs* —— 20
3. Pseudo-Lysias —— 21
4. Philodemus of Gadara —— 23
5. Diodorus Siculus —— 26
6. The gnomological tradition —— 28
7. Scholia to the comedies of Aristophanes —— 31
8. The Arabic tradition —— 35
   A. Abū l-Wafāʾ al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik —— 36
   B. Ibn Durayd —— 38
   C. Qustā ibn Lūqā —— 40
   D. Pseudo Al-Ǧāḥiẓ —— 40

III. The Life of Diagoras —— 43

1. Dating —— 43
2. *Curriculum vitae* —— 46

IV. The Problem of Diagoras' Atheism —— 61

1. Methodological issues —— 61
2. The origins of atheism in ancient Greece —— 66
3. Reasons for Diagoras' atheism —— 74
4. Books attributed to Diagoras —— 78
   A. Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι —— 80
      a. Interpretation of the title —— 80
      b. The question of authorship —— 84
   B. Φρύγιοι λόγοι —— 86
   C. Conclusions —— 98
5. Anecdotes presenting Diagoras' critical attitude towards religion —— 98
   A. Throwing a statue of Heracles into the fire —— 98
   B. Other anecdotes —— 102

C. Why were Diagoras' words and deeds also attributed to Diogenes of Sinope? —— 103
6. Was Diagoras a radical atheist? —— 111

V. Diagoras as the Supposed Author of the Commentary on the Derveni Papyrus —— 117

VI. Conclusions —— 127

Appendix I: Diagoras as an Impious Person and Atheist —— 133

Appendix II: *Contra Deos Testimonium* —— 139

Appendix III: Gods Punish Those Who Stay With an Impious Person —— 147

Bibliography —— 151
1. Editions —— **151**
   A. Editions of testimonies on Diagoras and fragments of his poetry —— **151**
   B. Editions of authors cited in the book —— **151**
2. Research papers —— **159**

Indexes —— 199
1. Index of names —— **201**
2. Index of geographical and ethnic names —— **206**
3. Index of subjects —— **208**
4. Greek and Latin words and expressions —— **212**
   A. Greek words and expressions —— **212**
   B. Latin expressions —— **213**
5. Index of passages —— **214**

Abbreviations

AC	L'Antiquité Classique
A&A	Antike und Abendland
A&R	Atene e Roma
AGPh	Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJPh	American Journal of Philology
AncSoc	Ancient Society
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, hrsg. von H. Temporini, W. Haase, Berlin-New York 1972 ff.
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
ASNP	Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa
BAGB	Bulletin de l'Association de G. Budé
BCH	Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
BICS	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
BMCR	Bryn Mawr Classical Review
BNJ	Brill's New Jacoby ed. by I. Worthington, Leiden (online)
BzA	Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Stuttgart et al. 1990 ff.
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, vol. I–XXIII, Berolini 1882–1907.
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CCG	Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, Turnholti 1977 ff.
CCL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, Turnholti 1954 ff.
C&M	Classica et Mediaevalia
ClAnt	Classical Antiquity
CPG	Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, edd. E.L. Leutsch, F.W. Schneidewin, vol. I–II, Gottingae 1839–1851 (reprint Hildesheim 1958).
CPh	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	Classical Review
CrErc	Cronache Ercolanesi
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vindobonae 1866 ff.
DK	Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, hrsg. von H. Diels, W. Kranz, I–II, Berlin ^{6}1951–1952 (reprint Zürich 2004–2005).
DLZ	Deutsche Literaturzeitung
DNP	Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike, hrsg. von H. Cancik, H. Schneider, Bd. I–XII, Stuttgart-Weimar 1996–2002.
DPhA	Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques, publié sous la direction de R. Goulet, Paris 1994 ff.
EI^{2}	The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, vol. I–XII, Leiden, 1960–2004.
EI^{3}	The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Third Edition, Leiden, 2007 ff.
EPRO	Études Préliminaires aux Religions dans l'Empire Romaine, Leiden 1961–1992.
FGrHist	Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, hrsg. von F. Jacoby, Bd. I–III Berlin-Leiden 1923–1958 (reprint Leiden 1967–1996).

GB	Grazer Beiträge
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte, Leipzig-Berlin 1897 ff.
G&R	Greece & Rome
GGM	Geographi Graeci Minores, vol. I–II, ed. C. Müller, Parisiis 1855–1861 (reprint Hildesheim 1965 and 1990).
GHI	A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, ed. by M.N. Tod, vol. I–II, Oxford ^{2}1946–^{2}1948.
GRBS	Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies
HdA	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
HGIÜ	Historische griechische Inschriften in Übersetzung. Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und übersetzt von Kai Brodersen, Wolfgang Günther und Hatto H. Schmitt, Darmstadt 2011 (überarbeitete Sonderausgabe der 1992–1999 bei WBG erschienenen drei Bände).
HGL	Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike, Bd. I: hrsg. von B. Zimmermann, Bd. 2: hrsg. von B. Zimmermann, A. Rengakos, München 2011–2014.
HSCPh	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
ICS	Illinois Classical Studies
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin 1873 ff.
JbAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JHI	Journal of the History of Ideas
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
KP	Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike, hrsg. von K. Ziegler und W. Sontheimer, Bd. I–V, München 1964–1975.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1911 ff.
LCM	Liverpool Classical Monthly
LGPN	A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, ed. by P.M. Fraser et al., vol. I–V, Oxford, 1987–2014.
LIMC	Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, vol. I–IX, Zürich-München-Düsseldorf 1981–1999.
LSCG	Lois sacrées des cités grecques, éd. par F. Sokolowski, Paris 1969 (École Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires 18).
LSJ	A Greek-English Lexicon compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. Revised and augmented throughout by H.S. Jones. With revised supplement, Oxford 1996.
MH	Museum Helveticum
ML	A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. Edited by Russell Meiggs, David Lewis, Revised Edition, Oxford 1988 (Oxford ^{1}1969).
NJA	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum
OGIS	Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger, Leipzig, 1903–1905.
OSAPh	Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy
PA	I. Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica. Editio altera lucis ope impressa. Inscriptionum Graecarum conspectum numerorum addidit S. Lauffer, Berolini, 1966 (1. edition Berolini 1901–1903).
PCG	Poetae Comici Graeci, edd. R. Kassel, C. Austin, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1983 ff.

PCPhS	Proceedings of Cambridge Philological Society
PG	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 1–161, Paris 1857–1866.
PGM	Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri, 2. Auflage hrsg. von K. Preisendanz, A. Henrichs, Stuttgart 1973–1974.
PhU	Philologische Untersuchungen, Berlin 1880–1926.
PMG	Poetae Melici Graeci, ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962.
PP	Parola del Passato
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien, Berlin 1963 ff.
QS	Quaderni di Storia
QUCC	Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, hrsg. von Th. Klauser et al., Stuttgart 1950 ff.
RE	Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung von G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler, Stuttgart 1893–1980.
REA	Revue des Études Anciennes
REG	Revue des Études Grecques
RFIC	Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica
RGRW	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
RGVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, Gießen-Berlin 1903 ff.
RhM	Rheinisches Museum
SCh	Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1942 ff.
SCO	Studi Classici e Orientali
SGLG	Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, Berlin 1974 ff.
SGRR	Studies in Greek and Roman Religion, Leiden 1980 ff.
SIFC	Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica
SIG	Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger, vol. I–IV, Leipzig ^{3}1915–^{3}1924.
SO	Symbolae Osloenses
SÖAW	Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SSR	Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae. Collegit, disposuit, apparatibus notisque instruxit G. Giannantoni, Napoli 1990 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 18).
SVF	Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, ed. J. ab Arnim, vol. I–III, Lipsiae 1903–1905 (reprint Stuttgart 1968).
TAPhA	Transactions and Proceedings of American Philological Association
ThGL	Thesaurus Graecae Linguae ab H. Stephano constructus … tertio ediderunt C.B. Hase, G.R.L. de Sinner, Th. Fix, W. Dindorf, L. Dindorf, vol. I–VIII, Paris 1831–1865.
ThWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, hrsg. von G. Kittel und G. Friedrich, Bd. I–X, Stuttgart 1933–1979.
TrGF	Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, vol. I: Didascaliae, catalogi, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum, edd. B. Snell, R. Kannnicht, Göttingen ^{2}1986; vol. II: Adespota, edd. R. Kannnicht, B. Snell, Göttingen 1981; vol. III: Aeschylus,

	ed. S. Radt, Göttingen 1985; vol. IV: Sophocles, ed. S. Radt, Göttingen ^{2}1999; vol. V: Euripides, ed. R. Kannnicht, Göttingen 2004.
TrRF	Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, vol. I: ed. M. Schauer, vol. II: ed. G. Manuwald, Göttingen 2012.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, hrsg. von A. Harnack, O. Gebhardt, C. Schmidt, Leipzig-Berlin 1882 ff.
UaLG	Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Berlin 1968 ff.
VCh	Vigiliae Christianae
WdF	Wege der Forschung, Darmstadt 1956–1995.
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WSt	Wiener Studien
WüJbb	Würzburger Jahrbücher
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

I. Current State of Research

The first serious attempt to present Diagoras of Melos[1] as a person may be considered an article by Pierre Bayle (1647–1706) in *Dictionnaire historique et critique. Troisième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée par l'auteur*, II, Rotterdam, 1720, pp. 991–995. This dictionary has been published many times and translated into other languages. Good orientation in the subject is also provided in the *Bibliotheca Graeca*, published by Johannes Albertus Fabricius (1668–1736), and expanded on in the fourth edition by Gottlieb Christoph Harles (1738–1815) [Hamburg, 1790–1791, vol. I, pp. 626–627; vol. II, pp. 119–120 and pp. 654–656]. Towards the end of the 18th century Theodor Gotthold Thienemann (1754–1827) published a paper entitled 'Über den Atheismus des Diagoras von Melos', *Beyträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, hrsg. von Georg Gustav Fülleborn, Stück 11–12, Jena, 1799, pp. 15–56. Referring to nineteen writers, Thienemann for the first time compiled in clear manner a large number of the testimonies on the subject of Diagoras and subjected them to a critical analysis. Noteworthy are also the comments (*Zusatz vom Herausgeber*) G.G. Fülleborn (1768–1803) included after Thienemann's article on pages 57–63, e.g. he pointed out that the concept of atheism in ancient times was different to that of modern times.

In the 19th century two dissertations on Diagoras appeared: Daniel Ludovicus Mounier, *Disputatio philosophico-literaria de Diagora Melio*, Diss. Lugduni Batavorum, Roterodami, 1838, and Theodorus Münchenberg, *De Diagora Melio*, Diss. Halis Saxonum, 1877. Mounier referred to the views of M.H.E. Meier, who wrote the entry 'Diagoras' in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* hrsg. von J.S. Ersch– J.G. Gruber, Leipzig 1833, Section 1, Part 24, pp. 439–448. Münchenberg, on the other hand, used a commentary to Aristophanes' *Frogs*, published by Franz Volkmar Fritzsche (1806–1887) [Zürich 1845, pp. 180–186]. Although these authors knew more testimonies than Thienemann, they did not carry out a critical analysis of the ancient tradition and took at face value information originating from late antiquity. Moreover, Fritzsche and Münchenberg did not reckon Diagoras fled from Athens in 415 as the ancient sources state, but instead were convinced this happened in the 430s BC.

In 1900 Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) devoted a four-page passage (pp. 80–84) to Diagoras in the book *Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin, 1900 (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. IV 3). This passage was one of the

1 I was unable to find the treatise *De atheismo Diagorae*, published by Mariangelus Bonifacius a Reuten. It was referred to by 18th- century authors, but available bibliographies do not mention it.

main sources of knowledge about Diagoras for classical philologists of the first half of the 20th century, since the aforementioned dissertations were not easily accessible. Similarly significant was the great reputation of the scholar who wrote it. According to Wilamowitz, Diagoras' flight occurred in 415/414. Some progress in the study of Diagoras was made by the Belgian scholar Eudore Derenne in his book on the trials against impiety, *Les procès d'impiété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes au Ve et IVe siècles avant J.-C.*, Liège-Paris 1930 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 45) [reprint: New York, 1976]. The chapter devoted to Diagoras (pp. 57–70) included a new interpretation of the title of Diagoras' work Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι. In 1950 Italo Lana (1921–2002) published a study 'Diagora di Melo', *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, vol. II, 1949/1950), Torino, 1950, pp. 161–205. A reprint, entitled 'Diagora di Melo e la costituzione di Mantinea', appeared in Lana's *Studi sul pensiero politico classico*, Napoli, 1973, pp. 63–104. It includes critical analyses of most of the testimonies, though the ones found in the dissertations of Mounier and Münchenberg have been overlooked, because Lana had no access to them. A weak side of Lana's work is his theory that Diagoras lived in the years 530–446, which seems very unlikely.

A breakthrough in the study of Diagoras came with the paper *Diagoras ὁ Ἄθεος*, which was published in English by the German classical philologist Felix Jacoby (1876–1959) in *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, Jg. 1959, Nr. 3.[2] It includes a critical edition of the more significant testimonies and for the first time an important Arab testimony, translated into German by the orientalist Franz Rosenthal in 1937. It originates from the work *Muḫtār al-ḥikam wa maḥāsin al kalim* (*Choicest Maxims and Best Sayings*), by the Arab writer Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik, who lived in the 11th century (see chap. II 8 A). Jacoby analysed the ancient tradition with great scholarship and insightful criticism, which led him to many interesting conclusions. Nevertheless, it is difficult to agree with two of his basic theses: 1) that Diagoras escaped from Athens towards the end of the 430s BC, 2) that Diagoras was the first radical atheist in antiquity. These theories were correctly questioned by the Swiss scholar Fritz Wehrli (1902–1987) in a review of Jacoby's work (Gnomon 33, 1961, pp. 123–126). A few years later Jacoby's arguments were also questioned by the Canadian scholar Leonard Woodbury (1918–1985) in

2 F. Jacoby wrote about Diagoras in a commentary to the Attidographer Melanthius: FGrHist III b I, Leiden, 1954, 198–201 (Text) and FGrHist III b II, Leiden, 1954, 165–167 (Notes). Already then he predicted that he intended to publish a work on Diagoras (p. 199 'I hope to do this in a special paper').

a valuable article, 'The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos', Phoenix 19, 1965, pp. 178–211. Nevertheless, he also put forward several theories, e.g. regarding the interpretation of the titles of Diagoras' work and the origins of atheism, which in my opinion are unacceptable.

In the years 1979–1980 a two-part monograph by Marek Winiarczyk appeared, 'Diagoras von Melos – Wahrheit und Legende', Eos 67, 1979, pp. 191–213 and 68, 1980, pp. 51–75. It includes a critical discussion of all the relevant literature since the 17th century and presents extensively the life and work of Diagoras. The author tried to show that Diagoras could not be considered the first atheist in antiquity. He also presented a hypothesis that Diagoras did not write the work Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι, normally ascribed to him, but instead that it was written by a sophist in the first half of the 4th century BC. Moreover, that Φρύγιοι λόγοι were an apocryphal work written and attributed to Diagoras in the Hellenistic period. M. Winiarczyk's monograph was highly appraised by other scholars[3] and became a basis for further research on the subject of Diagoras. M. Winiarczyk also published a new edition of Diagoras' testimonia and fragments of his poetry: *Diagorae Melii et Theodori Cyrenaei reliquiae*, Leipzig, 1981 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana).[4] Today scholars cite testimonies of Diagoras according to this edition. This edition was based on an unpublished doctoral thesis *Diagoras z Melos – prawda i legenda. Monografia, testimonia, fragmenty* [Diagoras of Melos, the truth and legend. Monograph, testimonia and fragments], Wrocław, 1976, which M. Winiarczyk wrote under the supervision of Professor Jerzy Łanowski.

M.M. Shakhnovich published an article 'Diagor Melosskij – anticznyj kritik religii' [Diagoras of Melos – an ancient critic of religion] in R.F. Filippova (ed.), *Problemy religiewiedienia i ateizma w muzejach*, Leningrad 1989, pp. 130–143,

3 See Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 166, n. 37, 'Die brilliante Arbeit Winiarczyks, die auch bisher meist unberücksichtigte Testimonien in die Analyse miteinbezieht, markiert den Stand der Forschung, über seine Erkenntnisse wird man ohne Neufunde kaum hinausgelangen können'; Hordern, *Philodemus* (2001), 33, n. 2, 'Winiarczyk's two essential articles on Diagoras, to which I am deeply indebted'; Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 6, n. 22, 'On Diagoras see the excellent studies of M. Winiarczyk ... These render obsolete those of F. Jacoby ... and L. Woodbury; Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 373, 'I shall mainly rely on Marek Winiarczyk's collection of ancient evidence on Diagoras, accompanied by a circumspect discussion of this author.'

4 This edition of Diagoras had reviews in the following: *Platon* 34/35, 1982/83, 199–202 (P.K. Georgountzos); RPh 57, 1983, 126 (É. des Places); AC 52, 1983, 348 (R. Joly); BAGB 1983, 219 (J. Irigoin); *Studia Filozoficzne* 1983 No. 4, 195–198 (A. Nowicki); *Salesianum* 46, 1984, 319–320 (B. Amata); *Arctos*, NS 18, 1984, 175 (H. Thesleff); *Vichiana* 14, 1985, 204 (A. Garzya). M. Winiarczyk published a supplement to this edition, *Ergänzungen zu Diagoras* (1989), 151.

which presents the views of other scholars, but brings nothing new into the study of the subject. The author accepts the ancient tradition about the atheism of Diagoras.

Bernhard Smarczyk devoted a passage to Diagoras (pp. 278–287) in his book *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund*, München, 1990 (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 5). There the author put forward an interesting theory that Diagoras started criticising the Eleusinian Mysteries after the first-fruits decree of March/April 415 BC, which was issued because Athens wanted to convert it into a central festival of the Delian League. This theory was later referred to by Christoph Auffarth in an article, 'Aufnahme und Zurückweisung "Neuer Götter" im spätklassischen Athen: Religion gegen die Krise, Religion in der Krise?', Walter Eder, (Hg.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* Akten eines Symposiums 3.–7. August, 1992, Bellagio, Stuttgart, 1995, pp. 337–365, esp. pp. 340–341.

In 1990 E. Christian Kopff published an article 'The Date of Aristophanes' *Nubes* II', AJPh 111, 1990, pp. 318–329, in which he tried to show that the second version of Aristophanes' *Clouds* was written in 414/413 and the sentencing of Diagoras had nothing to do with the events in 415. This rather unconvincing view has been rejected by most scholars.[5]

In the 1990s Frank E. Romer published two articles: 'Atheism, Impiety and the Limos Mēlios in Aristophanes' *Birds*', AJPh 115, 1994, pp. 351–365 and 'Diagoras the Melian (Diod. Sic.13.6.7)', Classical World 89, 1996, pp. 393–401. In the first he put forward the bold hypothesis that Diagoras and his opinions are present throughout Aristophanes' comedy *The Birds*. Even the idea of building a city in the sky to block out the Olympian gods Aristophanes was supposed to have taken from Diagoras' Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι. I argue with this hypothesis in chap. II 2 B. In the second article, Romer questions the credibility of the account of Diodorus Siculus, according to which Diagoras was convicted in 415/414. See critical remarks in chap. II 5.

In 1996 a short book by Bronisława Witz-Margulies, *Diagor Melosskij* [Diagoras of Melos], came out in Grodno. A large part of it (pp. 43–78) is a translation into Russian of all the testimonies and fragments concerning Diagoras. The author upheld the numeration of the testimonies in the edition of M. Winiarczyk. In her opinion, the ancient tradition regarding Diagoras' atheism is reliable.

5 Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 591–601; Storey, *The Dates* (1993), 71–84; Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 354 n. 10; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 208 n. 37. Probably only Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2002), 1-n. 2 accepted Kopff's hypothesis.

In the years 1997–2006 Richard Janko published four articles in which, among other things, he tried to prove that Diagoras was the author of the commentary on the Derveni Papyrus.[6] This was rightly rejected by other scholars. It was very thoroughly examined by the Hungarian scholar Gábor Betegh in his book *The Derveni Papyrus. Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*, Cambridge 2004, pp. 373–380 (Appendix: Diagoras and the Derveni author). See chap. V below.

At the start of the 21st century James Hordern published the article 'Philodemus and the Poems of Diagoras', ZPE 136, 2001, pp. 33–38. He analysed the accounts of Philodemus of Gadara on the poetry of Diagoras and made a number of comments on the life of Diagoras, with which I do not always agree (see chap. II 4). The Φρύγιοι λόγοι problem was meticulously studied by James B. Rives in the article 'Phrygian Tales', GRBS 45, 2005, pp. 223–244.

Also writing on Diagoras have been the scholars of the histories of religion and philosophy in the 5th country BC, the editors of Aristophanes' comedies the *Clouds*, the *Birds* and the *Frogs* as well as historians discussing the capture of Melos by Athenian troops in 416/415. Nevertheless, these generally brief reflections bring nothing new into the study of the subject. That is why I do not provide the full titles of these works, though I do mention some of them in connection to specific cases below.

6 Janko, *The Physicist as Hierophant* (1997), 87–92; *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 6–15; *God, Science and Socrates* (2002/2003), 11–18; *Socrates the Freethinker* (2006), 54–57.

II. Analysis of the More Important Sources

1. Hermippus

In his comedy Μοῖραι, staged in 430,[1] Hermippus compares a rapidly growing person to Diagoras with the nickname Τερθρεύς.[2] This nickname is associated with the verb τερθρεύεσθαι ('be characterised by extreme subtlety') as well as the noun τερθρεία ('excessive subtlety'), and probably meant a 'swindler' or 'wind-bag'. τερθρεία, which was usually used in reference to rhetoricians,[3] philosophers[4] or certain aspects of religion,[5] always had a pejorative meaning.[6] Isocrates, in the preface to his declamation Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον (c. 4), urges sophists to abandon τερθρεία and start seeking the truth. A less probable hypothesis connects the word Τερθρεύς with τέρθρον ('the end of a sailing ship yard').[7] This could be interpreted as 'son of a mast'.[8] It is debatable as to whether τοῦ Τερθρέως is a fictitious demotic[9] or a patronymic. Here some scholars see an allusion to Diagoras of Melos,[10] which would mean he was a known figure in the 430s.

---

1 Cf. Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles* (1971), 101–109. Text in PCG V, 1986, 579–584 (frags. 42–50).

2 Hermippus, fr. 43 Kassel-Austin (PCG V 580) = T 86.

3 Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. II 22 τὴν τερθρείαν τὴν ῥητορικήν.

4 Diog. Laert. I 17 διαλεκτικοὶ δε ὅσοι περὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων τερθρείαν κατατρίβονται; Eus. *Praep. ev*. III prol. 1 τὰς σεμνοφανεῖς καὶ σοφιστικὰς τερθρείας.

5 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. II 19, 3 writes that when Romans introduced foreign cults, they removed from them ἅπασαν ... τερθρείαν μυθικήν.

6 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 10 ll. 7–13. Cf. Hesych. Alex. s.v. τερθρεία (IV 29 Hansen-Cunningham)· λογομαχία. ἀπάτη. φλυαρία. φληναρία; Photius, *Lex*. s.v. τερθρεία (III 459 Theodoridis)· ἡ λεπτολογία ... ἄλλοι δὲ τερθρείαν φασὶ τὴν φλυαρίαν; Etym. Magn. s.v. τερθρεία (752 Gaisford); Suda s.v. τερθρεία (IV 526 Adler); Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων, s.v. τερθρεία 467 Cunningham.

7 Photius, *Lex*. s.v. τερθρεία (III 459 Theodoridis); Suda s.v. τερθρεία (IV 526 Adler).

8 Cf. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 10 ll. 25–34, rejected the view of Richardson, *ΤΕΡΘΡΕΙΑ* (1945), 59–62, which suggested that τερθρεία was 'a nautical metaphor' (p. 62).

9 Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (1993), 233 'an imaginary demotic which suggests 'quibbler'". Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* (1957), I, 297 n. f 'son of Terthreus, a mock-name suggesting τερθρεύεσθαι". Cf. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (1986), 331–332 'If his father's name was something even remotely Terthreus, therein lay the pun; but if his deme was Teithras we have here a punning demotic to set beside the many in Aristophanes'; Jacoby, *op. cit*., 10 ll. 13–15 'Τερθρεύς should mean not only a "quibbler", but the native of a country where this sort of reasoning and speaking is in vogue, a gas-bag, wind-bag, swindler or even impostor'.

10 Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1845), 185–186; Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (1906), 379; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 108 n. 10; Jacoby, *op. cit*., 9–10; Sommerstein, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1987), 271; Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 354; Bremmer, *Religious Secrets* (1995), 75; *idem*, *Atheism* (2007), 18.

However, scholia to Aristophanes' *Frogs* 320 (T 8) and the *Suda* (s.v. Iakchos [II 602 Adler] = T 86) claim that this was a reference to a different Diagoras. Hence, it seems to me that it would be best not to take this comedy fragment into account in trying to reconstruct the life of Diagoras of Melos,[11] since we can neither verify nor disprove the testimony. We should also note that the name 'Diagoras' is common enough in the Aegean region but very rare in Athens.[12]

2. The comedies of Aristophanes

A. *The Clouds*

In the *Clouds* 830 Strepsiades, speaking with his son Pheidippides, calls Socrates a Melian (Μήλιος), because the philosopher argued that there was no Zeus and instead the world was ruled by a Vortex (Δῖνος).[13] Earlier (vv. 368–407) Socrates had explained to Strepsiades that the rain and lightning strikes were not the work of Zeus but instead happened naturally.[14] For simple and uneducated people such an interpretation of natural occurrences seemed impious, as did indeed philosophical studies of nature in general.[15] That is why Aristophanes could jokingly call him Socrates the Melian, suggesting that the philosopher was as godless as

11 Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 124; Woodbury, *The Date and Atheism* (1965), 187. 197; Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung* (1971), 109, n. 20; cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 208, n. 37 'less certain'; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 167, n. 41 'zweifelhaft'.

12 Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (1993), 233. See LGPN I–V (1987–2014); PA I 254; Trail, *Persons* (1996), V, 300–301 (nr 323180–323260).

13 See Ferguson, *ΔΙΝΟΣ* (1971), 97–115; Perilli, *La teoria del vortice* (1996).

14 Socrates as a philosopher of nature: Vander Waerdt, *Socrates in the Clouds* (1994),48–86; Althoff, *Sokrates als Naturphilosoph* (2007), 103–120; Döring, *Sokrates und die Naturphilosophie* (2010), 9–23. Scholars generally accept the influence of Diogenes of Apollonia (DK 64). I do not discuss whether Socrates is presented in *Clouds* I the same way he is presented in *Clouds* II. Nor is there any room here to consider the important question as to whether the Socrates in the comedy is the Socrates we know. Cf. Weiher, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott* (1913), 5–18; Gelzer, *Aristophanes* (1970), 1441–1445; Vander Waerdt, *Socrates* (1994), 52–66; Auffarth, *Ein seltsamer Priest* (1999) 85–89. See chap. V, n. 38.

15 Pl. *Apol*. 18 bc; Pl. *Leg*. VII 821 a; XII 967 a; Plut. *Nic*. 23, 3–4; Apul. *Apol*. 27 Cf. Capelle, *Μετέωρος* (1912), 414–448, esp. 428 ff. 'Zugleich aber gerät der Meteorologe – wohl nicht ohne Mitschuld des Anaxagoras ... allmählich in den Ruf des Atheisten, so daß es gefährlich werden kann, als Erforscher der *μετέωρα* verschrien zu werden' (p. 438); idem, *Meteorologie* (1935), 317–319; Schubert, *Die Macht* (1993), 97–98. Cf. Gemelli Marciano, *Die Vorsokratiker* (2007), I, 427–430 (natural philosophers and physicians were accused of practicing sorcery).

Diagoras of Melos.[16] This comedy includes the first clear allusion to the views of Diagoras and it is therefore important to establish when it was written.

The Clouds was probably staged on the second day of the City Dionysia, that is on the 10th day of Elaphebolion (i.e. the second half of March)[17] in 423, when the eponymous archon was Isarcus.[18] Although Aristophanes considered the *Clouds* to be his best comedy, in the contest it only came third. The first prize was awarded to Cratinus for Πυτίνη (*The Wine flask*), and Ameipsias was awarded the second prize for his comedy Κόννος. According to a hypothesis proposed by Wolfgang Luppe (1931-2014),[19] during the Peloponnesian War (431–404), the practice of five comedies being performed in one day was continued, but only the three best poets were awarded prizes. Aristophanes could not come to terms with not coming first and so he decided to rewrite his comedy to be able enter it in the contest again.[20]. The author of the *hypothesis* (I Dover = VI Wilson) argues that the poet removed some elements, introduced others and elsewhere not only transformed the structure but also the behaviour of the characters. Among the most important alterations, the *hypothesis* includes a new parabasis for the chorus (vv. 518–561), an agon of two Arguments (Λόγοι, vv. 889–1104) and the end of the comedy, in which Strepsiades sets fire to the school (φροντιστήριον) of Socrates.[21]

---

16 A different interpretation was proposed by R. Janko. See chap. V.

17 I accept the reconstruction of the City Dionysia proposed by Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966), 142. Similarly Möllendorff, *Aristophanes* (2002), 51. Other hypotheses are discussed by Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals* (1968), 65–66; Csapo, Slater, *The Context* (1995), 107; Olson, *Broken Laughter* (2007), 19; Zimmermann, *Das Drama* (2011), 471–472.

18 This is confirmed by the *hypothesis* II Dover (= V Wilson) as well as by the *didaskaliai*, published in: Mette, *Urkunden* (1977), 106–107.

19 Luppe, *Die Zahl der Konkurrenten* (1972), 53–75; idem, *ἀπεώσθη πάλιν εἰς τοὺς Ληναικούς* (1982), 157–159; *idem*, *Zur angeblichen Nachmittags-Aufführung der Vögel* (1999) 57–59. Similarly, Möllendorff, *Aristophanes* (2002), 51 with n. 72. Whereas, according to Mastromarco, *Guerra peloponnesiaca* (1975), 469–473; *idem*, *Introduzione a Aristofane* (1994), 9–10 five comedies were staged in the years 426–421 and 415–404. Previously scholars had believed that throughout the Peloponnesian War only three comedies were staged, e.g. Körte, *Komödie* (1921), 1229 ll. 11–25; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 61–62; Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals* (1968), 83; Geissler, *Chronologie* (1969), 18; Lesky, *Geschichte* (1971), 473.

20 The problem of the relation between *Clouds II* and *Clouds I* is discussed, for instance in: Dover, *Aristophanes, Clouds* (1968), LXXX–XCVIII; Gelzer, *Aristophanes* (1970), 1434–1436; Guthrie, *Socrates* (1971), 56–57; McDowell, *Aristophanes* (1995), 134–136; Casanova, *La revisione delle* Nuvole (2000), 19–34.

21 τὰ μὲν γὰρ περιῄρηται, τὰ δὲ παραπέπλεκται καὶ ἐν τῇ τάξει καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν προσώπων διαλλαγῇ μετεσχημάτισται, ἃ δὲ ὁλοσχερῆ τῆς διασκευῆς τοιαῦτα ὄντα τετύχηκεν. αὐτίκα ἡ μὲν παράβασις τοῦ χοροῦ ἥμειπται, καὶ ὅπου ὁ δίκαιος λόγος πρὸς τὸν ἄδικον λαλεῖ, καὶ τελευταῖον ὅπου καίεται ἡ διατριβὴ Σωκράτους (*hypoth*. I Dover = VI Wilson).

It seems that Aristophanes presented the partly altered comedy to the archon, but failed to receive a chorus and therefore did not make any other changes. Perhaps that is how we can interpret the words of the *hypothesis*, which states that the poet suffered an even greater defeat and would never again stage a new version of the play.[22] Aristophanes therefore did not alter the comedy enough for it to be put on stage. Alexandrian philologists still had both versions of the comedy, which is testified by the scholia to the *Clouds* 553. They tell us that Callimachus (fr. 454 Pfeiffer = fr. 500 Asper) noticed a mistake in the didaskalia, which state that the *Clouds* was performed in 423, whereas Eupolis' Μαρικᾶς, to which the parabasis in the *Clouds* refers, was actually staged two years later, in 421.[23] Eratosthenes, on the other hand, noted that the reference to the Μαρικᾶς comedy only appears in *Clouds II*, which was never staged and therefore could not be found in the didaskalia. Three more scholia also confirm the existence of two versions of this comedy: a) Σ^{Vb3} 1115 – Heliodorus (1st century AD) wrote a metric commentary to *Clouds* I, b) Σ^{VE} 543 – in *Clouds* I the school of Socrates is not set ablaze, c) Σ^{E} 520 – the parabasis in *Clouds* II is generally different and not in the same metre. For these reasons I consider unjustified the stance of some scholars who attribute the ancient testimonies of the comedy being altered to the erroneous speculations of ancient grammarians.[24]

The correlation between the two versions of the *Clouds* was discussed in modern times. Some scholars stressed the differences, while others minimised them.[25] In my opinion, this is not the place to discuss the various attempts to reconstruct *Clouds* I in detail and decide which parts remained in the altered version. I feel Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendoff (1848–1931) was correct to argue that we do not have the evidence to reconstruct *Clouds* I.[26] Nevertheless, I

22 ἀτυχῶν δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα οὐκέτι τὴν διασκευὴν εἰσήγαγεν (*hypoth*. II Dover = V Wilson). Thus, e.g. Fabrini, *Sulla rappresentabilità delle Nuvole* (1975), 4; Casanova, *op. cit*., 22; Lowe, *Comedy* (2007), 42.

23 Eupolis, Μαρικᾶς, frags. 192–217 Kassel-Austin (PCG V 399–424). See Storey, *Eupolis* (2003).

24 The first was Esser, *De prima et altera quae fertur Nubium Aristophanis editione* (1821), esp. 8 'secundam Nubium editionem … nusquam nisi in cerebro Scholiastarum exstitisse.' His dissertation was referred to by Heidhues, *Über die Wolken* (1897), esp. 42, and later Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie* (1957), 150–152; Erbse, *Über die ersten "Wolken"* (1969), 35–41, esp. 41 'daß die Vorstellung von einer selbstständigen Urfassung der Komödie eine Fiktion antiker und moderner Wissenschaft ist', reprint in Newiger (Hg.), *Aristophanes* (1975), 198–211. Scholars who rightly rejected this view include: Zacher, *review of Heidhues*, (1900), 33–41; Gelzer, op. cit., 1436; Zimmermann, *Die attische Komödie* (2011), 771–772 with n. 434.

25 *Forschungsbericht*: Casanova, *op. cit*., 21.

26 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), I, 99 n. 4 'Die ersten Wolken herstellen zu wollen ist ein eitles Unterfangen'. Unfortunately, many contemporary scholars have forgotten the wise words of this pre-eminent German classical philologist.

consider it virtually certain that the phrase Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος already appeared in the first version because Socrates is presented as s philosopher who explains natural phenomena without attributing them to the actions of the gods. Moreover, the question of the existence of Zeus is mentioned in several parts of the play (vv. 366–367, 826–828, 1470–1471).[27]

It is important to know when the second version of the *Clouds* was written. Scholars generally agree that the *terminus post quem* is the staging of Eupolis' Μαρικᾶς in 421 and Hermippus' *Female Bread-Sellers* (Ἀρτοπώλιδες) in 420, about which Aristophanes writes in a parabasis (vv. 553–557). Most scholars believe the *terminus ante quem* is the ostracism of Hyperbolus.[28] The dating of this event, however, is very uncertain. Various years have been proposed, including 418, 417, 416 and 415,[29] but, unfortunately, they are all based on subjective speculations, and there is no shortage of other suggested dates.[30] It needs to be clearly stated that this problem will never be satisfactorily resolved.

Another subject that scholars have needed to consider is how copies of the new version of the comedy came to be disseminated. The most likely assumption is that the script of the play was circulated in Athens when Aristophanes was still alive.[31] Much less convincing is the hypothesis that the comedy was published after his death, when it was found in his literary legacy.[32] Even less probable is the view that *Clouds* II was written as a version to be read.[33] Let us add that *Clouds* I had already disappeared during the Roman Empire period.

---

27 Perhaps only Kopff, *The Date of Aristophanes* (1990), 323, believed that the term Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος first appeared in *Clouds* II.

28 A different view is held by Kopff, *op. cit.*, 326.

29 Cf. Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *A Historical Commentary*, (1981), V, 257–264; Rhodes, *The Ostracism of Hyperbolus* (1994), 85–98; Heftner, *Zur Datierung* (2000), 27–45 ('das Frühjahr 416'); Forsdyke, *Exile, Ostracism* (2005), 170–175 (415); Mann, *Die Demagogen* (2007), 230–243 (416); Heftner, *Alkibiades* (2011), 67–70 (416).

30 420–416: Zimmermann, *op. cit.*, 771; 420–417: Dover, *op. cit.*, LXXX, 420–415: MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens* (1995), 135, n. 43; 421–418: Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 247 with n. 5; Guthrie, *Socrates* (1971), 56; 419/418: Geissler, *Chronologie* (1969), 37; Edmonds, *Die zweite Auflage* (1941), 290; „it cannot be later that c. 418": Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 581; 'around 418': Lowe, *Comedy* (2007), 41; 414 or 413: Kopff, *op. cit.*, 318–329, esp. 326. Janko accepted his view, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2002), 1, n. 2, but it was rightly rejected by Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 591–601; Storey, *The Dates* (1993), 71–84; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 208, n. 37.

31 As already argued by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Chor der Wolken* (1921), 738, reprint in: Newiger (Hrsg.), *Aristophanes* (1975), 170; *idem*, *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), I, 98–99, n. 4; Dover, *op. cit.*, XCVIII; Fisher, *Aristophanes* (1984), 20–21; Casanova, *op. cit.*, 31 with n. 43.

32 Howald, ΑΕΝΑΟΙ ΝΕΦΕΛΑΙ (1922), 24 'als Nachlaßausgabe gedacht werden kann'; Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 601 'our text derives from Aristophanes'Nachlass'.

33 Fowler, *Taplin on Cocks* (1989), 257 'the revision of Clouds was published as a reading version'.

B. *The Birds*

The comedy the *Birds* was probably performed on the second day of the City Dionysia, that is 10th Elaphebolion, i.e. the second half of March 414, when Charias was archon. It won the second prize, after Ameipsias' Κωμασταί (*Revellers*), and before Phrynichus' comedy Μονότροπος (*Solitary*), which came third.[34] In the *Birds* two Athenians leave their city to find somewhere more peaceful to live (v. 44 τόπον ἀπράγμονα). With the help of birds they found Cloudcuckooland (Νεφελοκοκκυγία), situated between the heavens and earth. In the *epirrhema* of the second parabasis (vv. 1072–1078 = T 15) a chorus of birds announces a decree against Philocrates, an enemy of the world of birds, who sells birds and persecutes them. A reward of one talent is offered for killing him and four talents for capturing him alive (vv. 1077–1078).

This fictitious decree is preceded by two other decrees: against Diagoras (vv. 1072–1074) and against deceased tyrants, i.e. the Pisistratids (vv. 1074–1075). Other testimonies confirm that one talent was indeed supposed to be awarded for the killing of Diagoras and two for bringing him alive to Athens.[35] This decree was inscribed on a bronze stele,[36] and fragments of it have been passed on by the Atthidographer Melanthius (FGrHist 326 F 3) in the work Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι μυστηρίων in the 4th century BC,[37] and by Craterus (FGrHist 342 F 16) in a work

34 See Hypoth. I 8–10, cf. Hypoth. II 38 Wilson.

35 Diod. Sic. XIII 6, 7 (T 17); Ioseph. *C. Ap*. II 226 (T 18 A-B); Lib. *Apol. Socr*. 154 (T 19); Cyr. *C. Iul*. VI 190 (T 20); Ammon. *De voc. dif*. 184 (T 21); *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073 (T 7 A); *Schol. Arist. Ran*. 320 (T 8); Tzetzes, *Comment. in Arist. Nub*. 829a (T 11). It is worth noting that the inhabitants of Samothrace issued a decree against a person who committed a profanation of the Cabeiri mysteries: Ael. fr. 45 Hercher = fr. 48 b Domingo-Forasté = Suda s.v. ἀναδεῖ (I 166 Adler) [= Diag. T 101 B] καὶ οἱ Σαμόθρᾳκες κηρύττουσι κήρυγμα, τὸν ζῶντα ἀναγόντα αὐτὸν δύο τάλαντα ἔχειν; Ael. fr. 45 = fr. 48 a Domingo-Forasté = Suda s.v. ἐξεφοίτα (II 309 Adler) = Ps.-Zonaras s.v. ἐξεφοίτα [= Diag. T 101 A] ὃ δὲ παρὰ τοὺς ἀτελέστους καὶ βεβήλους ἐξεφοίτα τὰ τῶν Σαμοθρᾴκων ὄργια· ὃς φωραθεὶς ἀπέδρα πρὸς τοὺς Κυζικηνούς. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 1285 and Kern, *Kabeiros* (1919), 1435–1436; *idem*, *Die Religion* (1935), II, 289, n. 1, assumed that these testimonia could concern Diagoras. Although it cannot be ruled out, it is also not possible to confirm this hypothesis.

36 Stroud, *A Fragment of an Inscribed Bronze Stele* (1963), 138, n. 1, provides the testimonies of Athenian bronze steles. Cf. Pollux X 97 Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς στήλαις, αἳ κεῖνται ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, τὰ τῶν ἀσεβησάντων περὶ τὼ θεὼ δημοσίᾳ πραχθέντα ἀναγέγραπται. The fragments of the steles are edited by Pritchett, *The Attic Stelai I–II* (1953), 225–299 (edition) and (1956), 178–317 (commentary); *idem*, *Five New Fragments* (1961), 23–29; Lewis, IG I^3 421–430 (pp. 402–424). Cf. Pippin, *The Demioprata of Pollux X* (1956), 318–328; Lewis, *After the Profanation* (1966), 177–191, reprint in: *idem*, *Selected Papers* (1997), 158–172.

37 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 12, ll. 1–3 dated Melanthius' work to the second half of the 4th century, whereas Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (1893), I, 286 and Tresp, *Die Fragmente*

entitled Συναγωγὴ τῶν ψηφισμάτων, perhaps published after 295 BC.[38] What is disputed is when this decree was actually declared.[39] The matter would seem straightforward, since according to Diodorus Siculus (XIII 6, 7 = T 17) Diagoras was convicted during the archonship of Charias in 415/414, but this testimony is sometimes questioned (see chap. II 5). Some scholars maintained that Diagoras was convicted much earlier, but the arguments they proposed are not very convincing.[40] It was not until Felix Jacoby thoroughly analysed diverse testimonies that the idea was put forward of Diagoras being convicted in 433/432 after the ψήφισμα decreed by Diopeithes.[41] Jacoby stressed that the works of Melanthius and Craterus, fragments

(1914), reckoned it was the first half of the 4th century. Jacoby, FGrHist III b I, 1954, 198 believed Melanthius lived in the years 350–270 and was a contemporary of Philochorus. On the works of Melanthius, see the commentary of Jacoby, *FGrHist* III b I, 1954, 196–201 and FGrHist III b II, 1954, 164–167. Edition: Tresp, *op. cit*., 54–56 and FGrHist 326 F 2–4.

38 Cf. Krech, *De Crateri* (1888); Jacoby, *Krateros* (1922), 1617–1621; *idem*, FGrHist III b I, 1955, 94–109 and FGrHist III b II, 1955, 62–77; *idem*, *Diagoras* (1959) 11–12; Higbie, *Craterus* (1999), 46–54; BNJ ad 342 F 16. Jacoby assumed that Craterus was the half-brother of Antigonus II Gonatas, the king of Macedonia. This hypothesis was rejected by Lendle, *Einführung* (1992), 275 and Erdas, *Niebuhr, Jacoby* (2004), 91–102. Edition: FGrHist 342 F 1–8; Erdas, *Cratero* (2002).

39 Rosenmeyer, *Notes on Aristophanes' Birds* (1972), 236–237 considered the possibility that the Athenians did not actually issue a decree against Diagoras, and the tradition that such a decree had been issued stemmed from Aristophanes' comedy. The author, nevertheless, sensibly concluded that: 'It is obviously impossible to prove that the tradition about Diagoras rests on nothing firmer than an Aristophanic joke.' That is why the imputations of some scholars that Rosenmeyer rejected the historicity of the decree are unfounded. Thus Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 275, n. 287; Hubbard, *The Mask* (1991), 175, n. 48; Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 355, n. 13. Perhaps only Krokiewicz, *Sokrates* (1958), 160, reckoned that trial of Diagoras bore the signs of being a later invention.

40 Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1845), 180; Münchenberg, *De Diagora* (1877), 14–16; Müller-Strübing, *Protagorea* (1880), 82–83; Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (1916), II 2, 374–375; Meyer, *Geschichte* (1954), IV 1, 752 n. 1. Their arguments include the following: 1) Diagoras is closely connected with the deceased tyrants in *Aves* 1072–1075 (T 15), and therefore was also long dead, 2) Nicodorus' legislation coincided with the συνοικισμός in Mantinea, 3) You could not hand over fugitives during the Peloponnesian War. However, Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 39, n. 137 rightly rejected such arguments, even though he himself believed that Diagoras had been convicted earlier.

41 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 19–24. See Plut. *Per*. 32, 2 καὶ ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας, ἀπερειδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι' Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. Most scholars dated ψήφισμα to 433/432 or 432/431. E.g. Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 21; Reverdin, *La religion* (1945), 208; Nestle, *Asebieprozesse* (1950) 737; Mikalson, *Athenian Popular Religion* (1983), 92 ('ca. 433'); Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 208; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 471 ('um 432'). Other suggested dates include: 438/437: Mansfeld, *The Chronology* (1980), 80; 437/436: Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 525; Bloch, *Diopeithes* (1997), 664; 430 (i.e. the year of the plague): Adcock, The *Attacks* (1927), 478; Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *A Com-*

of which are found in scholia to Aristophanes' comedies (*Aves* 1073 – T 7 A, *Ranae* 320 – T 8), do not include the exact date of Diagoras' conviction. In his opinion, Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BC), the author of Χρονικά, had in his possession an undated decree, whereas the year of the archonship of Charias he deduced from the decree mentioned in the *Birds* (vv. 1073–1074), which was performed in 414, and also from the events in Athens that followed the mutilation of the Herms as well as the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries shortly before the Athenian fleet set sail for Sicily, which was still during the archonship of Arimnestus in 415. Jacoby moreover believed that no document could help date the decree. That is why he decidedly rejected the view of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,[42] who maintained that the decree was dated, and even if it did not bear the name of the archon, Melanthius would have certainly known the correct date. Moreover, Jacoby believed the first scholion to the *Birds* 1073 was misleading in stating that Diagoras moved to Athens after the capture of Melos in 416/415,[43] whereas the true version of events was provided in the second scholion, according to which the decree against Diagoras was declared more or less when Melos was being captured. This scholion later states that nothing stood in the way of the decree being issued earlier.[44] And it is this piece of information that Jacoby considered the *terminus ante quem* of the conviction of Diagoras. On the basis of this assumption, he shifted the trial of Diagoras to the end of the 430s BC. In his opinion, this was supported by the fact that Hermippus' comedy Μοῖραι was performed in 430 and it mentioned a Diagoras Terthreus (see chap. II 1). This did not necessarily mean that the decree was not renewed in 415/414, since it is mentioned by Aristophanes in his comedy the *Birds* 1073.

Jacoby's arguments were criticised by Leonard Woodbury (1918–1985), who believed that they were unsubstantiated.[45] Above all, in his opinion, there were

mentary (1962), II, 187; Longrigg, *Death* (2000), 62–63; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 90; Strothmann, *Asebie* (2003), 169. The 430s in: Swoboda, *Diopeithes* (1903), 1047; McDowell, *The Law* (1978), 200. It does not seem right to question the historicity of the decree the way Dover has done in *The Freedom of the Intellectual* (1975), 39–41, reprint in: *idem*, *The Greeks* (1988), 146–147. Similarly Yunis, *A New Creed* (1988), 68–69. Critical comments in: Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 196, n. 72; 525, n. 1; Parker, op. cit., 208, n. 40; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 93–95 (here further literature). On Diopeithes, cf. Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 19–24; Schachermeyr, *Religionspolitik* (1968), 61–65; Flower, *The Seer* (2008), 124-125; Rubel, *Stadt* (2000), 109–119; *idem*, *Fear* (2014), 41–45, 198–200.

42 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 82 'Dieser Beschluss war selbstverständlich datiert, und auch wenn kein Archon darin stand, so konnte Melanthius ihn doch nicht falsch ansetzen, mögen auch die Scholiasten nur mit einem undatierten Excerpte operieren'.

43 μετὰ τὴν ἅλωσιν Μήλου ᾤκει ἐν Ἀθήναις (*Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073).

44 ἐκκεκήρυκται δὲ μάλιστα ὑπὸ τὴν ἅλωσιν τῆς Μήλου, οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει πρότερον (*Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073).

45 Woodbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 193–197.

insufficient grounds to suppose that the second scholion to the *Birds* 1073 is more reliable, since it cannot be shown that it was based on the analysis of an official document. It seems that a contradictory dating of the decree was already present in a source that was used by both scholiasts.[46] The dating of the second scholiast was merely a conjecture based on an anecdotal tradition that linked the conviction of Diagoras with the capture of Melos in 416/415.[47] In this respect the speculations of Didymus and the sources that he used are no more valuable than the year of Charias' archonship according to Apollodorus. Therefore, it seems that Jacoby was wrong to attach so much importance to the second scholion to the *Birds* 1073 and assume that the capture of Melos was the *terminus ante quem* of Diagoras' conviction.

L. Woodbury rightly noted that Jacoby's dispute with Wilamowitz was pointless because we are unable to determine whether the decree included the archon's name. It has to be stressed that none of the hypotheses can be proved or disproved. It is patently obvious that opting for any of them can only be based on an *a priori* assumption. If one is inclined to assume that the decree was issued in the 430s or a couple of years before 415, one also has to assume that it did not include the name of the archon. Supporters of the opposite view, in turn, have to assume that the decree was dated. The only thing that is certain is that the *Birds* 1072–1074 provides the *terminus ante quem* for the conviction of Diagoras.

It is very unlikely that in 415/414 the Athenians would renew a decree against Diagoras, who according to Jacoby had not been in Athens since 433/432. It seems even less likely that Aristophanes would recall an old decree from 433/432, since Diagoras was a favourite target of his attacks from the *Clouds* to the *Frogs*, and the situation in Athens in 415 was very conducive to the issuing of a decree against an old enemy of Eleusis. Equally insufficient as evidence is the account of Al-Mubaššir, according to whom, Diagoras' escape preceded a long war between

46 Even Jacoby, *op. cit*., 11, ll. 12–14 conceded that Didymus or his source (see chap. II 7) had combined information passed on by Melanthius and Craterus with information taken from a biography of Diagoras and thus the chronological mix-up occurred at a fairly early stage.

47 The existence of an anecdotal tradition is evidenced in *Schol. Arist. Nub*. 830 (T 6 A), which speaks of how the attitude of Diagoras led to the mocking of the impiety of the Melians. There we also read that the Athenians were supposed to have destroyed Melos because they were so outraged by the atheist Diagoras. One cannot rule out that this was an echo of Athenian propaganda, which tried to associate Melos with the atheism of Diagoras (Woodbury, *op. cit*., 195). Such propaganda would have been an attempt to at least to some extent justify the Athenians' cruel treatment of the inhabitants of the Island of Melos, cruelty which was then condemned by the Greek poleis (cf. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 40 n. 152). Nevertheless, Jacoby, *op. cit*., 19 ll. 43–45, considered the existence of such an anecdotal tradition to be debatable.

the inhabitants of Athens and the Peloponnese. Jacoby naturally had in mind the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431. However, this could equally well have been a reference to the second phase of the war following the final collapse of the Peace of Nicias. Besides, one should treat very carefully the chronology provided by this Arab writer. For instance, he erroneously states that Diagoras spent 54 years in Pellene (see chap. III 1).

Also doubtful is the hypothesis that Athenian hostility against the Pellene followed its refusal to allow for the extradition of Diagoras (see chap. III 2), and that this was the reason why the small Achaean polis joined the Spartan side at the start of the Peloponnesian War. It could be equally true that Diagoras fled to Pellene exactly because he knew that relations between Pellene and Athens were already hostile.

Moreover, we should note that Diopeithes' motion had a distinctly political motive.[48] Although it was a direct attack on the philosopher Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, it was also indirectly aimed at his personal friend Pericles (cf. n. 41). According to Plutarch, also put on trial were Aspasia and Phidias, people closely associated with Pericles.[49] Yet it seems doubtful that at the time anyone would be interested in a lyric poet who had no contacts with Pericles, even if people had heard of his critical attitude towards the Eleusinian Mysteries. In 414/415, however, the atmosphere in Athens was quite different. This was a time when the hermokopids and other persons accused of the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries were hotly pursued. Then a person known for his critical attitude towards the Mysteries could no longer avoid being accused of impiety.

One may also add another argument against the 433/432 conviction of Diagoras that was not considered by Woodbury. According to Jacoby (p. 8, ll. 4–6), Diagoras was not present in Athens during the staging of Aristophanes' *Clouds* in 423. If the Athenians had known that Diagoras had left Pellene, with which

48 Cf. Miltner, *Perikles* (1937), 778–780; Kienast, *Der innenpolitische Kampf* (1953), 210–229 (Thucydides, son of Melesias, after returning from his ostracism in 433, became the moving spirit behind the attacks on Pericles); Frost, *Pericles, Thucydides* (1964), 385–399, reprint in: Wirth (Hrsg.), *Perikles* (1979), 271–289 (The attacks on Pericles were inspired by Eucrates, Lysicles and Cleon); Schachermeyr, *Religionspolitik* (1968), 67–73; Klein, *Die innenpolitische Gegnerschaft*, in: Wirth (Hrsg.), *Perikles* (1979), 494–533; Ostwald, *From the Sovereignty* (1987), 181–198.

49 A critical discussion of the trials of Anaxagoras, Aspasia and Phidias (the sources, dating and issue of historicity) would take up too much space and upset the composition of this book. That is why I have referred to relevant literature in the Introduction, n. 5, and in chap. III, 1, n. 15. Other works are listed in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 89–125; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000); *idem*, *Fear* (2014). I feel research very much requires a comprehensive monograph on this complicated and controversial problem.

they were in conflict, and moved to Mantinea, with which they were at peace, they would have demanded his extradition. If Mantinea had refused such a demand, it would be hard to imagine good relations between the two cities. Yet we know that there was no conflict between Mantinea and Athens in the mid–420s BC, and in 420 both cities signed a treaty.[50] This would surely have been impossible if Mantinea had granted asylum to a sacrilegious fugitive from Athens for whose head there was a very high price. It seems far more probable that Diagoras was not yet in trouble with the Athenian authorities when he went to Mantinea.

The verb ἐπαναγορεύεται (*Aves* 1072) is a *hapax legomenon*, i.e. it only appears once in Greek literature. Nevertheless, scholars have for a long time assumed that ἐπαναγορεύω has a similar meaning to ἀναγορεύω, i.e. 'announce, proclaim'.[51] Then Jeffrey Henderson and Frank E. Romer gave the verb a different meaning: 'proclaimed again'.[52] Hence, they reasoned that the decree against Diagoras had been issued at least once during an earlier City Dionysia, i.e. before 415. Initially, Romer assumed the first decree was issued no later than in 417 or 416,[53] but later he proposed the timeframes 421/420 and 416/415, adding that 416/415 was more probable.[54] Romer's interpretation is, nonetheless, unconvincing because there is no evidence that the verb ἐπαναγορεύω in Aristophanes' comedy meant 'to proclaim again'. Secondly, we do not even know if the decree was actually declared during the City Dionysia. Perhaps it was an event invented by the playwright, one that served to prepare the audience for the decree against Philocrates, the seller of birds.

Scholars have considered why Aristophanes placed next to each other the decrees against Diagoras and against the tyrants. Perhaps he wanted to suggest that the measures against Diagoras, who had fled to Pellene, which was on the Spartan side in the Peloponnesian War, were as futile as those undertaken against long-deceased tyrants. At the same time the poet must have been laughing at the

50 Bölte, *Mantineia* (1930), 1322. Even Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 24 ll. 5–7 admitted that after the signing of the treaty in 420, staying in Mantinea would have been too dangerous for Diagoras.

51 Cf. ThGL III, 1835, col. 1400 'praeconis voce pronuntio'; Passow, *Handwörterbuch* (1847), I, 1005 b 'laut verkünden'; Kock, Schroeder, *Die Vögel* (1927), 129 'ἀναγορεύειν von jedem κήρυγμα, mit ἐπι- wendet sich die Ankündung noch besonders dringend an die Hörer'; LSJ I 607a 'proclamation is made'; Rosenmeyer, *Notes on Aristophanes' Birds* (1972), 233.

52 Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 597; Romer, *Diagoras* (1996), 395. Henderson's view was accepted by his student Marianetti, *Socratic Mystery-Parody* (1993), 8.

53 Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 355 'not later than 417, or just possibly 416'.

54 Romer, *Diagoras* (1996), 397–398. His view is rejected by Dreßler, *Philosophie vs. Religion?* (2010), 110–111, n. 56 'was jedoch nicht nachvollziehbar ist und daher nicht überzeugen kann'.

excessive fear of the return of tyranny.[55] It is worth recalling that the last tyrant of Athens had been Hippias, son of the tyrant Pisistratus, who had been expelled in 510. Later, in 490, he fought on the side of the Persians at Marathon (Hdt. VI 102–108) and also participated in the expedition of the Persian king, Xerxes, to Greece in 480 (Hdt. VII 6, 2; VIII 52, 2). At the end of the 5th century, therefore, there was no longer any real danger of tyranny, but before the People's Assembly convened, the herald cast a curse (ἀρά) on whoever wanted to become a tyrant or contributed to the return of a tyrant.[56] Imitating this custom is the chorus in Aristophanes' play Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι (vv. 338–339). After the defeat of the Athenian expeditionary force to Sicily in 413, an amnesty was granted to all the expellees with the exception of the Pisistratids.[57] Then when the oligarchic Council of 400 fell, Demophantes issued a decree (410) that foresaw a death sentence for anyone who would try to establish a tyranny. On the other hand, the killer of a tyrant would be treated like Harmodius and Aristogeiton and their descendants.[58] It is generally believed that the decree alluded to an old law which is mentioned in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, 16, 10.[59] Leofranc A. Holford-Strevens[60] drew attention to the fact that the repetition of an anachronistic decree had an interesting analogy in British history. The 1636 University of Oxford Statutes, which remained valid until the 19th century, required masters of the arts (MA) to solemnly pledge 'never to consent to reconciliation with Henry Simeon (whose son, also Henry, had murdered a student).' The university had passed such a clause in 1264 and did not repeal it for several centuries.

Also worth mentioning is F.E. Romer's new interpretation of the *Birds*.[61] In it he argues that Diagoras and his views are present throughout the comedy play. At its start (v. 186) Peisetairos jokes that the gods could be forced into submission through Melian hunger (λιμῷ Μηλίῳ), that is, by building a city in the air which will block the passage of sacrifices made by people on the ground to the gods

55 E.g. Aristoph. *Vespae* 464–465, 487–502; *Thesm*. 338–339, 1143; *Lys*. 619, 630; Thuc. VI 53, 3; 60, 1; *Athen. pol*. 16, 10. See MacDowell, *Andokides* (1962), 136; Lavelle, *Adikia* (1988), 37–38; Rosivach, *The Tyrant in the Athenian Democracy* (1988), 43–57; Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 583–584; Lenfant, *Rois et tyrans* (1997), 196–199.

56 See Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (1972), 36–37.

57 Marcellinus, *Vita Thuc*. 32 τοὺς γὰρ Ἀθηναίους κάθοδον δεδωκέναι τοῖς φυγάσιν πλὴν τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν μετὰ τὴν ἧτταν τὴν ἐν Σικελίᾳ.

58 Andoc. *Myst*. 97 ἐάν τις τυραννεῖν ἐπαναστῇ ἢ τὸν τύραννον συγκαταστήσῃ; Andoc. *Myst*. 98. See Canevaro, Harris, *The Documents* (2012), 119–125 (Demophantes' decree); Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants !* (2014), 15–53.

59 *Ath. pol*. 16, 10 ἐάν τινες τυραννεῖν ἐπανιστῶνται ἢ συγκαθιστῇ <τις> τὴν τυραννίδα, ἄτιμον εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος.

60 Holford-Strevens, *Killing Dead Tyrants* (1991), 68.

61 Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 351–365. Cf. Auffarth, *Der Opferstreik* (1994), 59–86, esp. 69 ff.

in heaven. This was an allusion to the fact that the Athenians had built a wall around the city on the island of Melos and thus starved the inhabitants into submission in the winter of 416/415 (see chap. III 2). Romer compares (pp. 357–358) the noun περιτείχισις ('surround with a wall') in Thucydides (V 114, 1; 115, 1; 116, 2) to the words ὁ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποτείχισας ('he who surrounded the gods with a wall'), uttered by Heracles in the comedy (v. 1576). Verses 1072–1074 speak of a decree issued against Diagoras, and in verse 1421 Peisetairos asks the sycophant whether he intends to go to Pellene, which in Romer's opinion is a reference to Diagoras' flight to that Peloponnesian city.

Moreover, Romer presumes (p. 357) that Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι ('Fortifying arguments'), which is attributed to Diagoras, was a work which had inspired Aristophanes.[62] In his opinion: 'Diagoras' treatise was the theological equivalent of the Athenian wall at Melos.' I have to plainly state that I find this bold hypothesis entirely unconvincing. Firstly, we do not know and never will know the content of the treatise. What is more, the interpretation of the title is equally uncertain, since the verb ἀποπυργίζω is a *hapax legomenon*. I wrote extensively on the various interpretations of the title in an article published in 1980, and though Romer cites my article in the bibliography to his article, he has clearly failed to carefully read my arguments (see chap. IV). Secondly, we do not know whether Diagoras really was the author of this work. I once tried to show that the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι could have been the apocryphal work of an unknown sophist, published under the name of Diagoras at the start of the 4th century BC. Unfortunately, Romer has not attempted to discuss my hypothesis. Nor has he tried to answer the question of the relationship between Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι and Φρύγιοι λόγοι, which is another work attributed to Diagoras. I discuss this problem in chap. IV 4, below. Romer's certainty that Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι included a criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries is surprising, since it contradicts his later arguments that Diagoras in his treatise wanted to fence off the world of the gods from the world of the people. Thirdly, it seems more likely to me that it was the sophist who was alluding to a comic theme in Aristophanes' play, and hence the title Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι. It is hard to believe that Aristophanes, whose comedies are full of quite fantastic and surprising ideas, would seek inspiration in such literature. It seems more probable that the poet simply decided to ingeniously employ a humorous reference to the well-known 416/415 siege of Melos in his play. Therefore, I do not think that Diagoras of Melos and the Melian hunger have to be inseparably connected.[63] I admit that

62 Earlier this view was also held by Katz, *The Birds* (1976), 373 and Corsini, *Gli'Uccelli'* (1987), 110.
63 Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 352 'Diagoras the Melian and the *limos Mēlios* are inseparable ideas here and the mention of either recalls the other.'

Romer's hypothesis is very interesting, but the arguments he uses to support it are unconvincing.

C. *The Frogs*

The comedy the *Frogs* was staged during the Lenaia, in the month of Gamelion, that is towards the end of January 405, and was awarded the first prize. It shows the journey to the underworld of the god Dionysus, who intends to bring back to Athens the recently deceased (406) tragedian Euripides. On the way he meets a chorus of people initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries (vv. 316–459), worshipping the god Iakchos,[64] whose effigy was carried in a procession from a sanctuary in Athens (the Ἰακχεῖον) to Eleusis. His name was also the name of the song sung during the procession,[65] that is why the slave Xanthias says that the initiated ᾄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἴακχον ὄνπερ διαγορας (v. 320 = T 85). The scholia to this verse (T 8) reveal that already in antiquity scholars had given it diverse interpretations. Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 216 to c. 144) believed that this was a reference to Diagoras (Διαγόρας), who mocked Iakchos (ellipsis ἄδει = χλευάζει). On the other hand, Apollodorus of Tarsus (perhaps 1st century BC)[66] maintained that the verse should be read δι' ἀγορᾶς, because Aristophanes had in mind a procession in honour of Iakchos that went through the agora (ellipsis ᾄδουσι).[67] There is also no consensus among modern scholars. Some opt for the interpretation of Aristarchus,[68] while others prefer the view of Apollodorus.[69] Only a few consider

64 On Iakchos, see Kern, *Iakchos* (1914), 613–622; Graf, *Eleusis* (1974), 46–66; Sfameni Gasparro, *Misteri* (1986), 114–122; Simon, *Iakchos* (1990), 612–614; Clinton, *Myth and Cult* (1992), 64–71, 136–138; Jiménez San Cristóbal, *The Sophoclean Dionysos* (2013), 276–282.

65 E.g. Hdt. VIII 65, 1–4; Plut. *Phoc*. 28, 2; Arrian. *Anab*. II 16, 3; Suda s.v. Ἴακχος (II 602 Adler). Cf. Graf, *op. cit*., 48–50, 54–58.

66 Cf. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1892), II, 178 'wirkte vor Didymus'.

67 The procession probably began at the Iakcheion, which was near the Sacred Gate in Kerameikos, and did not pass through the agora. Thus Graf, *op. cit*., 49 with n. 43. Cf. Parker's different opinion in n. 69.

68 E.g. the publishers of *The Frogs*: F.V. Fritzsche (Zürich 1845); F.H.M. Blaydes, Halle, 1889; J. van Leeuwen (Leiden 1896); Th. Kock (Berlin, [4]1898); B.B. Rogers (London-New York 1924); W.B. Stanford (London, 1958, [2]1963); D. Del Corno (Milano, 1985); A.H. Sommerstein (Warminster, 1996), Henderson (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 2002) and Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 134, n. 1; Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 65, n. 5; Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 124, Campbell, *Greek Lyric* (1992), IV, 342; Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 88 with n. 234; Hordern, *Philodemus* (2001), 36; Ford, *Dionysos' Many Names* (2011), 354; Griffith, *Aristophanes' Frogs* (2013), 180.

69 E.g. the publishers of *The Frogs*: V. Coulon (Paris, 1928), L. Radermacher (Wien, [2]1954, Graz, [3]1967), K. Dover (Oxford, 1993), N.G. Wilson (Oxford, 2007) and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Text-*

yet another solution. They presuppose Aristophanes deliberately used an equivocal phrasing.[70] It seems to me that we will never find out what Aristophanes had in mind, but we cannot rule out a deliberate ambiguity.

3. Pseudo-Lysias

In *Speech 6* the prosecution claims that Andocides is more godless than Diagoras because the latter 'committed impiety by speaking against holy things and festivals that were foreign to him, but this man has committed impiety by acting against those of his own city.' (transl. S.C. Todd).[71] Andocides, arrested following a denunciation, admitted to having participated in the mutilation of the Herms in 415 and in turn denounced others who were responsible for the mutilations. Isotimides then proposed a ψήφισμα, which was passed by the People's Assembly. This barred anyone who had confessed to an act of impiety from entering the agora and temples of Athens.[72] Therefore Andocides was forced to leave Athens and was only allowed to return in 402, following the issuing of an amnesty (his previous attempts to return in 411 and 407 had ended in failure). As a wealthy merchant, he was immediately able to engage in public affairs. His enemies, however, used the Isotimides decree to accuse him of impiety in 400 or 399[73] after he had participated in the Eleusinian Mysteries. This time Andocides defended himself successfully, delivering his speech Περὶ μυστηρίων, which convinced the judges of his innocence.[74]

---

geschichte (1900), 81, n. 1; Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 9 ll. 33–34 [cf. nevertheless, p. 23, ll. 28–29], Woodbury, *The Date and Atheism* (1965), 187; Graf, *Eleusis* (1974), 49 with n. 2. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005), 348, n. 89 assumes the lesson δι' ἀγορᾶς 'is topographically defensible if we suppose that the procession started from the Eleusinion (whence the *sacra* probably had to be fetched) and struck up the Iacchus on the way through the agora to the Iaccheion'.

70 Del Corno, *Aristofane, Ranae* (1985), 174 'intendesse istituire una vera e propria polisemia'; Mastromarco, Totaro, *Aristofane, Commedie* (2006), II, 595, n. 56 'è possibile che Aristofane volesse creare questa ambiguità, e lasciasse all'abilità dell' attore il modo di rendere, nella recitazione, il sapido riferimento a Diagora, l'intellettuale melio condannato ad Atene per empietà'.

71 Διαγόρου τοῦ Μηλίου ἀσεβέστερος γεγένηται (scil. Ἀνδοκίδης)· ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ λόγῳ περὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἱερὰ καὶ ἑορτὰς ἠσέβει, οὗτος δὲ ἔργῳ περὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πόλει (Ps.-Lys. 6, 17= T 16).

72 Ps.-Lys. 6, 24 προσεψηφίσασθε ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν εἴργεσθαι τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν; Andoc. *De myst*. 71.

73 Most scholars say it was in 399, whereas the year 400 is supported by McDowell, *Andokides* (1962), 204–205; Price, *Religions* (1999), 82–84; Todd, *A Commentary on Lysias* (2007), 399 with n. 2, 410 with n. 43.

74 On the role of Andocides in the 415 events and his trial in 400 or 399, cf. MacDowell, *Andokides* (1962), 11–18, 204–205; Marr, *Andocides' Part in the Mysteries* (1971), 326–338; Pecorella Longo, *'Eterie'* (1971), 61–51; Edwards, *Greek Orators* (1995), 17–26; Todd, *A Commentary on Lysias* (2007), 399–403.

The meaning of the term λόγος in *Speech* 6, 17 is debatable. It is generally believed that this refers to the words of Diagoras, who convinced others not to become initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries.[75] The word ἔργῳ, treated here as the antithesis of λόγῳ, appears twice in another Lysias speech. First (9, 14) it means 'word – deed', but a little further on (9, 21) the meaning changes to 'seemingly – in reality'.[76] This double meaning also appears in the speeches of Isocrates, Νικοκλῆς (*Or*. 3, 61) and Φίλιππος (*Or*. 5, 6). Yet with other writers the λόγος in this antithesis might also mean 'composition, letter'. Such is the case in Isocrates's declamation Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον (*Or*. 10, 4),[77] which is why some scholars suppose that in the Lysias speech (6, 17) this could also mean the spoken and/or written words of Diagoras.[78] I see two arguments against this. Firstly, in the Lysias λόγῳ – ἔργῳ antithesis the λόγος does not mean 'written work'. Secondly, from the context it is clear that the λόγος in *Or*. 6, 17 means the spoken word. Trying to find here an allusion to Diagoras' written work is, in my opinion, an over interpretation. This is confirmed by the fact that the translators of the speech do not see in this passage an allusion to Diagoras' work.[79]

Scholars started questioning the authenticity of *Speech 6* already in the 19th century, stating that the vocabulary, composition and method of arguing were dif-

---

75 Woodbury, *op. cit*., 207, n. 82 'Diagoras' offence was committed in words'; Henrichs, *Die Kritik* (1974), 28 'ein mündlicher Akt der Asebie'; Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik (*1990), 283 n. 349 'nur mit Worten gegen die Festzeremonien verging'.

76 λόγῳ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς ἀγωνίζομαι, ἔργῳ δὲ περὶ πολιτείας (Lys. 9, 21). A similar meaning is found in: Aesch. *Prom*. 336 ἔργῳ κοὐ λόγῳ τεκμαίρομαι and Eurip. *Alc*. 339 λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν, οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι. Cf. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (1945), 44–45 'In dieser Form, wo λόγος nurmehr den Vorwand und Schein, ἔργον die Wirklichkeit bezeichnet, deckt sich die Antithese inhaltlich beinahe mit der spät-sophistischen νόμῳ-φύσει' (p. 45).

77 My attention was drawn to this (*per litteras*) by Walter Burkert. On the ἔργῳ–λόγῳ antithesis in Isocrates, cf. Zajonc, *Isokrates'Enkomion auf Helena* (2002), 99–100.

78 Cf. Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 494 with n. 7 'Erst der Mysterienfrevel des Jahres 415 wird die Aufmerksamkeit auf ihn (scil. Diagoras) als den (literarischen) Anstifter der Mysterienverachtung gelenkt ... haben'; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 90 'mündliche und schriftliche Aussagen'; Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 598 'The reference to a logos...leaves it unclear whether Diagoras offended in a speech or in a book'; Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 581 'but that it was in words (spoken or written?)'; Hordern, *Philodemus* (2001), 38 'λόγῳ could just as well refer to an offence in verse'. Cf. chap. III 2 n. 39.

79 E.g. J. van der Heyden, Hanau 1615, 64–65 'ille verbis quidem aliorum sacra et festos dies impie carperet'; L. Gernet, M. Bizos, Paris 1959, 97–98 'celui-ci n'avait commis q'un délit de parole contre les objets sacrés et les cérémonies d'une cité étrangère'; W.R. Lamb, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1957, 125 'for he was impious in speech regarding the sacred things and celebrations of a foreign place'; U. Albini, Firenze 1955, 345 'l'empietà di Diagora consisteva in discorsi contro gli oggetti sacri e le ceremonie di una città straniera'; I. Huber, Darmstadt 2004, "der spottete mit Worten in frevlerischer Weise über fremde Heiligtümer und religiöse Feste".

ferent to other Lysias speeches. Friedrich Blass (1843–1907) and Richard Claverhouse Jebb (1841–1905) in particular contributed to the fact that *opinio communis* came to consider the speech unauthentic.[80] Romuald Turasiewicz (1930–2005), nevertheless, tried to show that the arguments against its authenticity were unconvincing and strongly advocated the authorship of Lysias.[81] He drew attention to the fact that Lysias composed his speeches according to the personality and abilities of the given speaker.[82] Moreover, the main prosecution speech was delivered by Cephisius, which is why one should not attach too much importance to the order and type of arguments used. Unfortunately, Turasiewicz's monograph was only published in Polish (there is not even an abstract in English), and it is therefore quite unknown to and undiscussed by Western scholars. A good review of literature on the subject is provided by Stephen C. Todd,[83] who discusses the best known hypotheses on what *Speech 6* was: a) a speech delivered during the trial, authored by Lysias or someone else, b) a contemporary pamphlet issued after the acquittal of Andocides, and protesting against this verdict, c) a rhetorical exercise written later, in the Hellenistic period. In Todd's opinion, the last hypothesis should be decidedly rejected. He himself is of the view that *Speech 6* was an additional speech that the prosecutor would deliver just before Andocides' speech of defence, and that it was slightly altered before publication.[84]

4. Philodemus of Gadara

The Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara (c. 110 – after 40 BC)[85] criticised Stoic theology[86] in his treatise περὶ εὐσεβείας.[87] He even maintained the

80 Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* (1887), I, 562–570; Jebb, *The Attic Orators* (1893), I, 277–282. It should be added that already in antiquity there were those who doubted its authenticity. Cf. Harpocr. s.v. καταπλήξ et φαρμακός ('εἰ γνήσιος').

81 Turasiewicz, *Życie i twórczość Lizjasza* (1999), 130–141.

82 This was already noted by Dover, *Lysias* (1968), 82–83.

83 Todd, *A Commentary on Lysias* (2007), 403–408.

84 On the relation of Andocides' speech to that of Lysias, cf. Lämmli, *Das attische Prozeßverfahren* (1938), 17–57.

85 See Philippson, *Philodemos* (1938), 2444–2482, reprint in: *idem*, *Studien* (1983), 229–248; Dorandi, *Filodemo* (1990), 2328–2368; *idem*, *Filodemo storico* (1990), 2407–2423; *idem*, *Dichtender Philosoph* (1992), 183–193; Erler, *Philodem* (1994), 289–362; Arrighetti, *Filodemo* (2000), 13–31.

86 On Stoic theology, see Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1909), III 1, 140–152; Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (1948–1949), I 93–98, II 53–55; Long, Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (1987), I, 323-333; Gerson, *God and Greek Philosophy* (1990), 142–153, 289–293; Mansfeld, *Theology* (1999), 457–462; Algra, *Stoic Theology* (2003), 153–178.

87 Although the authorship is ascribed to Philodemus, only the first letter of the author's name (Φ) and the first letter of the title (Π) have survived in the colophon. The reconstruction

Stoics were making a graver mistake than Diagoras.[88]. Therefore he accused the Stoics of atheism,[89] whereas he downplayed the attitude of Diagoras, maintaining that he had been merely joking (ἔπαιξεν). Here he referred to Aristoxenus of Tarentum (4th century BC), who in his work Μαντινέων ἔθη (fr. 45a Wehrli²) defends Diagoras against the accusation of atheism. The Peripatetic philosopher had spent some time in Mantinea,[90] searching for materials for his history of music. There he found three pious poems by Diagoras, from which he cited fragments devoted to Arianthes of Argos and Nicodorus of Mantinea (F 1–2) as well as the title of a third poem: Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον.[91]

---

of the title is probable, because in PHerc. 1428, col. XV 20–21 the author uses the term περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον. Philodemus' authorship, however, was not proposed until Theodor Gomperz, and he actually conceded he could not prove his hypothesis. Cf. a fragment of his letter in Diels, *Doxographi* (1879), 530 'Es ist und bleibt, wenn auch im hoechsten Grad wahrscheinliche, Vermuthung.' Cf. Henrichs, *Toward a New Edition* (1972), 81 n. 37 'I am well aware, however, that the ascription of De pietate to Philodemus is hardly more than a time-honored convention, as there is no absolute proof of his authorship.' Previously scholars ascribed the work to the Epicurean Phaedrus, who was the author of the work Περὶ θεῶν (cf. Cic. Ad Attic. 342, 2 [= XIII 39]). The problems of the title and authorship are discussed in detail by Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 88–99.

88 ὥστ' ἔγωγε [κ]ἂν τεθαρ[ρ]ηκότως εἴπαιμι τούτους Διαγόρου [μ]ᾶλλον πλημελεῖν (PHerc. 1428, col. XI 5–7 Henrichs = T 69).

89 Also in the work Περὶ τῶν Στωικῶν Philodemus claims that *Politeia* by Zeno of Citium († 262/261), the first scholarch of the Stoic school, also included ungodly views – *De Stoicis* (PHerc. 155 et 339), col. XI 10–11 et XII 16–18 Dorandi. Texts accusing Stoics of atheism are cited by Winiarczyk, *Wer galt* (1992), 309–310. It is worth noting that the Stoics in turn were harsh critics of the theology of Epicurus, whom they considered an atheist. E.g. Posidonius of Apamea (c.135 – c.51) maintained that Epicurus only spoke of the existence of gods to avoid being accused of impiety, whereas in fact he did not believe in them. 'Posidonius disseruit ... nullos esse deos Epicuro videri, quaeque is de deis inmortalibus dixerit invidiae detestandae gratia dixisse' (fr. 22a Edelstein-Kidd, fr. 346 Theiler ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 123). Numerous testimonies of Epicurus's atheism have be collected by Winiarczyk, *Wer galt* (1984), 168–170; *idem*, *Wer galt* (1992), 307. Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 315–316 mentions places in the treatise περὶ εὐσεβείας where Philodemus defends Epicurus against the accusation of atheism. Cf. Obbink, *The Atheism of Epicurus* (1989), 202–215. Already in his lifetime Epicurus had to defend himself against the accusation of impiety in his letter to Menoeceus (Diog. Laert. X 123) ἀσεβὴς δὲ οὐχ ὁ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν θεοὺς ἀναιρῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας θεοῖς προσάπτων. See Essler, *Glückselig* (2011), 11–14; Hessler, *Epikur* (2014), 175–176. Following the deaths of the students of Epicurus, Metrodorus and Polyaenus in c. 278/277, Timocrates said that the gods had punished them for preaching atheism (Ael. fr. 39 Hercher = fr. 42a Domingo-Forasté ap. *Sudam* s.v. Ἐπίκουρος [II 363 Adler]). Also see, chap. IV 5 C, n. 238.

90 Aristoxenus fr. 1 Wehrli ap. Sudam s.v. Ἀριστόξενος (I 357 Adler).

91 Wehrli, *Aristoxenos* (1968), 63 and Wehrli, Wöhrle, Zhmud, *Der Peripatos* (2004), 577–578 presume that Μαντινέων ἔθη and Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον are one and the same text, though Philodemus regarded them to be two separate works. In my opinion, there are no grounds to question Philodemus' account.

The interpretation of this important testimonium depends on the reconstruction of col. XI 10–11 of the papyrus. Theodor Gomperz (1832–1912) included in his edition (Leipzig, 1866) the following text: τοῦτ' [αὐτ]ο[ῦ] ἐστ[ι]ν, which was generally accepted for over a century. This did not change until 1974, when Albert Henrichs published a new edition of PHerc. 1428. He then accepted the variant τοῦθ' ὑ[γι]ές ἐστ[ι]ν, which had already appeared in an unpublished dissertation by Adolf Schober.[92] Gomperz's text suggested that it referred to an atheistic work by Diagoras, whose authenticity Aristoxenus questioned. That is why many scholars assumed Philodemus' treatise confirmed the existence of a 4th-century BC prose book by Diagoras. Now the text presented by Henrichs no longer refers to atheism, but rather generally speaks of Diagoras' blasphemy against the gods (*Gotteslästerung*), which, according to Philodemus, could have been falsely attributed to him, since Aristoxenus had only known the pious poetry of Diagoras.[93] Henrichs suggested (p. 28) the verb ἔπαιξεν means spoken impiety (*ein mündlicher Akt der Asebie*), which is confirmed by Ps.-Lys. 6, 17. He also rejects the view that it could concern a written παίγνιον.[94]

A different approach to the problem has been taken by Dirk Obbink. While he accepts Henrichs's edition, Obbink gives it a different interpretation.[95] Referring to the arguments of Marcello Gigante (1923–2001),[96] he assumes that ἔπαιξεν means a frivolous work, or perhaps a 'symposiastic poem'. He tries to prove that the word παίζειν, which appears twice in Philodemus' epigrams – AP V 112 (111), 5 (ἐπαίξομεν) and AP IX 412, 7 (ἔπαιζον) – means 'to write poetry'.[97] I cannot agree

92 Philodemus, *De pietate pars prior*, ed. A. Schober, Diss. Königsberg, 1923. Printed version in: CrErc 18, 1988, pp. 67–125.

93 Henrichs, *Die Kritik* (1974), 21 'Jener nämlich trieb Scherz, falls selbst das wirklich wahr ist und (ihm) nicht (fälschlich) zugeschrieben'; cf. commentary on p. 28 'Die Stelle entfällt damit als direktes Zeugnis für das angebliche atheistische Buch des Diagoras. Similar interpretations of Philodemus' text are provided by Campbell, *Greek Lyric* (1992), 345 'for Diagoras spoke in jest – if indeed this (scil. the business of D.'s atheism) is correct, not merely imputed to him' and Kaiser, *Die Fragmente des Aristoxenos* (2010), 5 (fr. I a 1 45 'denn dieser hat die Götter verspottet, wenn dieser <Gedanke> überhaupt ihm gehört und nicht bloß zugeschrieben ist'), even though he accepted Gomperz's version. A different interpretation of Philodemus' text is given by Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 90 'if indeed this (sc. prose work of his) is genuine and not falsely attributed'. Whereas Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996) 208, n. 37 conjectures 'that spurious writings are alluded to' instead proposing the variant [ἀληθὲ]ς in l. 10.

94 Cf. Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 14, ll. 6–13.

95 Obbink, *How to Read* (1995), 207 'For he composed frivolously if this is indeed his work and not spurious, as Aristoxenus says'.

96 Gigante, *Filodemo* (1989), 136. This view was accepted by Sider, *The Epigrams of Philodemos* (1997), 168 (comments to epigram 29 = *Anth. Pal.* IX 412 = Philod. *Epigr.* 20 p. 362 Gow-Page).

97 Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 353 'but with the added implication that his engagement with such symposiastic poetry was a frivolous one' and "ἔπαιζον in Philodemus' epigram means 'wrote poetry'".

with Obbink's view that Diagoras wrote a sympotic piece.[98] Nor am I convinced by James Hordern's arguments that Philodemus had in mind a hymn to Iakchos, to which Aristophanes alludes in the *Frogs* 320 (see chap. II 2 C).[99] A. Henrichs's interpretation seems more convincing, though we should concede that we will never know for certain how Philodemus understood the verb ἔπαιξεν. Moreover, we do not know whether this verb originally appeared in Aristoxenus' text, or whether Philodemus was the first to use it. *Ignoramus et ignorabimus*.

5. Diodorus Siculus

In his *Bibliotheca historica*, Diodorus Siculus (1st century BC) states that Diagoras was accused of impiety during the archonship of Charias,[100] i.e. in 415/414 (= Ol. 91, 2). A similar statement is made by the Arab writer Al- Mubaššir ibn Fātik (11th century AD), whose account is discussed in chap. II 8 A below. Many scholars consider Diodorus Siculus to be a reliable source and therefore this information to be real. Naturally, of a different opinion, are those scholars who maintain that Diagoras was convicted in the 430s or a few years before 415. Most recently Diodorus' testimony has been questioned by Frank E. Romer,[101] whose arguments are as follows:

1. Romer *a priori* assumes that Diodorus could not write an error-free history based on an annalistic scheme, because the authors of his sources did not follow a uniform chronology.[102]
2. Romer accepts the commonly held view that short pieces of information at the end of long narratives originate 'from one or more trustworthy chronographic sources' (p. 393) on which the long narratives are not based. Many scholars consider the chronographic sources to be generally reliable.[103] Others,

98 Similarly Hordern, *Philodemus* (2001), 36 'Clearly he (scil. Philodemus) knew nothing of Diagoras'poetry beyond what he found in Aristoxenus, and nothing there suggests *sympotica*'.

99 Hordern, *op. cit*., 36–38, esp. p. 37 'Philodemus' ἔπαιξεν suggests that Diagoras inadvertantly offended the Athenian authorities. The use of the aorist indicates a single occasion. This would admirably suit context indicated by Aristophanes' *Ranae*'.

100 Kirchner, *Prosopographia* (1966), II, 421 (nr 15324); Develin, *Athenian Officials* (1989), 149. Cf. IG ^{3}I, 95; IG ^{3}I, 370, 61 (= ML 77, 61). Some sources call him 'Chabrias': Philoch. (FGrHist 328 F 134) ap. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 766; Diod. XIII 2, 1; *Schol. Arist. Plut*. 179.

101 Romer, *Diagoras* (1996), 393–401.

102 Romer, *op. cit*., 393 'the task of condensing and integrating narrative material from a wide variety of earlier and more detailed histories into a standard annalistic format was ultimately impossible, since the sources he drew on ... did not follow a uniform chronological arrangement'.

103 Cf. Schwartz, *Diodoros* (1903), 669 'Die Angaben dieses Chronographen sind im großen und ganzen sehr zuverläßig'; Kopff, *The Date* (1990), 325 n. 19 'Dates found at the end of years,

however, maintain that a good chronographic source does not always have to provide the correct date. Romer (p. 394) refers to the opinion of Russell Meiggs, according to which one can seldom rely on Diodorus' numbers and dates for the 5th century BC.[104] Romer additionally states (p. 399) that Diodorus 'could be inept in blending such sources into his own account'.[105] Citing a couple of incorrect dates to prove this point, Romer attaches great importance to the fact that Diodorus (XII 80, 5) states that Melos was captured in 418/417 and not 416/415.

3. Romer maintains (p. 399) that the decree against Diagoras was undated (i.e. it did not bear the name of the archon), whereas the 415/414 date resulted from the mere speculations of Melanthius and Craterus or some later chronographic source.[106] This problem is discussed above in chap. II 2 B.

The above arguments clearly show that Romer has failed to take into account extensive scientific literature which provides a quite new and different appraisal of the person and work of Diodorus Siculus. For a long time this historian was considered a thoughtless, none too clever compiler. Such views are reflected in Romer's statement (p. 399) that Diodorus 'could be inept'. Yet in the last two decades of the 20th century and at the start of this century a large number of works have given Diodorus a much fairer appraisal.[107] Moreover, Romer has failed to study literature on the way in which ancient scholars worked. It is particularly important to understand that they dealt with excerpts, which greatly affected how the work was drafted.[108]

---

often with the clue "At the same time as these things were happening" ... come from a competent chronological source, which is often right.' Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 18 ll. 39–40; 20 ll. 21–29 assumed that the author could have been Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BC).

104 Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (1972), 457 'It is only very rarely that we can rely on Diodorus for numbers and dates.'

105 Cf. Romer, *op. cit*., 400 'Even good chronographic sources, however, may be hard to use, and Diodorus does make his share of mistakes.'

106 A view held earlier by Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 20 ll. 6–29 and Henderson, *Problems* (1993), 597.

107 Cf. Bigwood, *Diodorus* (1980), 195 with n. 2 and p. 207; Càssola, *Diodoro* (1982), 725–728; Sacks, *Diodorus* (1990), 70–82; Chamoux, *Un historien mal-aimé* (1990), 243–252; Spoerri, *Diodorea* (1991), 310–319; Chamoux, *Introduction* (1993), XVIII–XXII; Wirth, *Diodor* (1993); Sacks, *Diodorus* (1994), 213–232; Green, *Diodorus* (2006), 1–47; Wiater, *Geschichtsschreibung* (2006), 248–271; Bleckmann, *Diodor* (2010), 435–450.

108 Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius* (1978), 16–29; Moraux, *Diogène Laërce* (1986), 254–255, 260–263; Dorandi, *Den Autoren* (1991), 11–33. Cf. Münzer, *Beiträge* (1897); Laqueur, *Diodorea* (1958), esp. 268 and 290; Skydsgaard, *Varro* (1968), 101–116; Burkert, *Philodems Arbeitstext* (1993), 90.

It is true that the *Bibliotheca historica* does include various mistakes even when the author used a good chronographic source. Some of these errors are of the historian's own fault. Nevertheless we can easily explain why Diodorus erroneously said that Melos was captured in 418/417 and not 416/415. He writes that Nicias captured Cythera, Nisaea and Melos in 418/417. That last piece of information is wrong because Nicias had actually commanded an expedition against Melos in 426 (Thuc. III 91, 1–2). The historian had confused that expedition with the more famous expedition against Melos in 416/415, which ended with the capture of the city. We should, nevertheless, remember that factual errors may be found in the works of many other ancient historians.

It seems to me that Romer makes an important methodological mistake in his article by trying to prove a predetermined thesis. First he questioned the intellectual qualifications of Diodorus to be able to write a valuable synthesis. Then he identified certain errors in his work and from that inferred that the information regarding the conviction of Diagoras must also be wrong. Thus Diodorus was at fault because he lacked the intelligence to make proper use of the information in his source. Even if Diodorus had found the name of archon Charias in some text, in Romer's opinion, the author of the chronographic source had had no access to the decree and relied on the accounts of Melanthius and Craterus, who had seen an undated decree. It was the latter two who arbitrarily established the date of the decree by connecting it with the mutilation of the Herms and the profanation of the mysteries in 415. Romer accepts a number of unverifiable suppositions to support his *a priori* determined hypothesis that Diodorus' account is unreliable. Let us add that some years ago Alexander Rubel said that he found Romer's interpretation rather unconvincing, though he did not explain his opinion in detail.[109]

6. The gnomological tradition[110]

In Greek poetry one frequently finds general sayings (gnomes) regarding the human condition and various moral questions that had been used for the instruction of children and youths since the Archaic age. Many readers took excerpts

109 Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 171, n. 52 'Zuletzt hat F.E. Romer ... wenig überzeugend die Glaubwürdigkeit Diodors und des arabischen Historikers angezweifelt ... .'

110 On Greek gnomologies, cf. Richard, *Florilèges grecs* (1964), 475–512, reprint: *idem*, *Opera Minora* (1976); Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature* (1975), 9–35; Searby, *Aristotle* (1998), 28–41; Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 39–93. The word γνωμολογία does appear in Plato (*Phaedr*. 267c). It does not actually mean a gnomologium, but instead the style of a speaker using a maxim.

from the works they read to create their private collections of interesting quotes. In the Classical period these interests led to the first collections of poetic gnomes and florilegia intended for schools. They remained popular to the end of antiquity and were passed on to medieval literature.

Another phenomenon was the use of the philosophical anecdote as an element of style also applied in the creation of χρεῖαι collections, which probably emerged in the Hellenistic period. *Chreiai* collections were eventually combined with florilegia and used by the authors of various literary works (e.g. Diogenes Laertius).[111]

Some gnomologies and florilegia/anthologies include anecdotes ascribed to Diagoras. Here it is worth noting that there is a significant difference between the two (incidentally modern) terms, though some scholars consider them to be interchangeable. Gnomologies include gnomes (γνῶμαι) and sayings (ἀποφθέγματα) which most scholars associate with the χρεῖαι.[112] Florilegia, on the other hand, include not only gnomes and sayings, but also excerpts from literary works. A gnome is an anonymous, succinct thought concerning ethical problems and is considered to have a binding force.[113] An apophthegm[114] occurs when a gnome is ascribed to a particular person and often the addressee as well as the circumstances in which the statement is made are also known. We know the *apophthegmata* of kings, military leaders, politicians, philosophers and sages. Ancient rhetoricians did not discuss apophthegms separately because they considered them to be a constituent part or sub-category of χρεία.[115]

---

111 See Searby, *Aristotle* (1998), 29. Anecdote is a modern term which corresponds to *apophthegm* or *chreia*. Cf. Klauser, *Apophtegma* (1950), 545 'Das Apophtegma entspricht also etwa unserer "Anekdote"'; Searby, *op. cit.*, 15 'Anecdote captures the meaning of χρεία very nicely.'

112 Berger, *Hellenistische Gattungen* (1984), 1093 and Stenger, *Apophthegma* (2006), 218 nevertheless, try to show certain difference between *apophthegm* and *chreia*. The definition of *chreia* is found in the *Progymnasmata* of several rhetoricians of the Roman Empire period (Aphthonius, Hermogenes, Nikolaos, and Theon). Cf. Hermog. *Progymn*. 3 p. 6 Rabe 'Chreia is the "recollection" [*apomnemoneuma*] of a saying or action, or simultaneously both, which includes a succinctly expressed thought and is usually for some reason considered useful'. It is assumed that the creator of the first χρεῖαι collection was the Cynic philosopher Metrocles, student of Crates of Thebes (Diog. V B 412 [SSR II 387] ap. Diog. Laert. VI 33). Cf. Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 467–468.

113 The term γνώμη was used by 4th-century authors: Xenoph. *Mem*. IV 2, 9; Isocr. *Ad Nicoclem* (or. 2), 44; Arist. *Rhet*. II 21, 1394 a 22; 1395 a 11. Cf. Quint. *Inst. orat*. VIII 5, 3 *sententiae vocantur, quas Graeci γνώμας appellant*.

114 The term ἀπόφθεγμα appears for the first time in Xenophon (*Hellen*. II 3, 56), who cites the words of the sentenced to death Theramenes.

115 On terminological problems, see Wartensleben, *Begriff der griechischen Chreia* (1901); Gemoll, *Das Apophthegma* (1924); Horna, von Fritz, *Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologien*

When reading gnomologies and florilegia, it is striking that the same anecdote is often ascribed to various people. This is also the case with Diagoras. It can be explained in various ways.[116] Most frequently we are dealing with mechanical errors. I shall mention a few examples.

a. If there are several consecutive statements ascribed to the same person, the *lemma* (i.e. the name of the author) was left out, and instead in the gnomologium or florilegium was applied the term ὁ αὐτός or τοῦ αὐτοῦ. If the copyist inadvertently overlooked the name of the author, he continued the ὁ αὐτός or τοῦ αὐτοῦ series, thus ascribing the statement to the wrong author.
b. Occasionally, people made corrections to the text and wrote another name in the margin, and these names could later be misaligned or completely replace the names of other authors.
c. When someone took excerpts from a thematically arranged gnomologium to create an alphabetically arranged one, it was easy to ascribe extracts beginning with ὁ αὐτός or τοῦ αὐτοῦ to the wrong authors.
d. In alphabetically arranged gnomologies misattribution was easy in the case of authors with similar names, e.g. Aristippus-Aristo-Aristoteles, Democritus-Demonax-Demosthenes, Bion-Bias or Bion- Dion.
e. Many personal Greek names are a composition of two elements and often the second element was in a abbreviated form, which led to the confusion of names such as Democritus and Demosthenes or Aristippus and Aristoteles. Similar mistakes occurred with the first part of the name, e.g. Theophilos-Diphilos or Isocrates –Socrates.[117]

There were also 'conscious mistakes'. The author of a gnomologium or florilegium could deliberately ascribe a saying to a certain philosopher solely to illustrate his character or make the collection more attractive by including the names of famous people, e.g. Aristotle. Sometimes a saying was ascribed to a philosopher because it seemed to reflect his views.

(1935), 74–90; Klauser, *Apophthegma* (1950), 545–547; Hollerbach, *Zur Bedeutung des Wortes χρεία* (1964), 74–81; Spoerri, *Gnome* (1967), 823–829; Chadwick, *Florilegium* (1969), 1131–1160; Kindstrand, *Anacharsis* (1981), 99–100; Berger, *Hellenistische Gattungen* (1984), 1092–1100; Hock, O'Neil, *The Chreia* (1986), 1–60; Kindstrand, *Diogenes Laertius* (1986), 221–224; Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 466–474 (χρεῖαι); Russo, *Prose Genres* (1997), 57–64, 148–149 ((ἀποφθέγματα); Searby, *Aristotle* (1998), 13–22; Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 27–35; Stenger, *Apophthegma, Gnome und Chrie* (2006), 203–221.

116 See Kindstrand, *Gnomica Basileensia* (1991), 22–24; Searby, *Aristotle* (1998), 24–26. Cf. Wehrli, *Gnome, Anekdote* (1973), 193–208; Dover, *Anecdotes, Gossip* (1988), 45–52.

117 Also see Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius* (1978), 25–28.

7. Scholia to the comedies of Aristophanes[118]

Scholia to the *Clouds*, the *Birds* and the *Frogs* include a lot of information on Diagoras, which is why it is important to determine their origins and value. We should remember that in antiquity the texts of comedies and those of the commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) were published separately, which is why the reader had to enter the fragment of the commentary he was interested in the margin of the scroll or codex. Scholars agree that later commentaries (e.g. Symmachus [c. 100 AD] and Phaeinus)[119] were based on a work by Didymus, who lived in the late 1st century BC and early 1st century AD,[120] and had access to the works of earlier Alexandrian scholars.[121] It is assumed that he acquired information about Melanthius and Craterus from a book on people who were ridiculed in a comedy (Περὶ τῶν κωμῳδουμένων) by Ammonius (2nd century BC), who was a student of Aristarchus of Samothrace.[122]

What is debatable is the emergence of the first edition of comedies with scholia. In the 19th century and early 20th century it seemed obvious that in the 4th or 5th century AD an anonymous grammarian put together copies of eleven of Aristophanes' comedies and entered on the margins of the parchment codex diverse comments, which he excerpted from various ὑπομνήματα. Thus the archetype of

118 On scholia to Aristophanes, cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung* (1907), 179–184; White, *Scholia* (1914), LXII–LXXVII; Boudreaux, *Le texte d'Aristophane* (1919), 171–188; Gudeman, *Scholien* (1921), 672–680; Zuntz, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien* (1975); Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (1993), 94–102; Maehler, *Die Scholien der Papyri* (1994), 124–127; Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 37–42; Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (2007), 28–30. On scholia in general, see Dickey, *op. cit*., 11–17; Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic* (2009), 8–14 ('Characteristics of scholia'); Montana, *The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora* (2011), 105–161, esp. 105–119 ('What is a *corpus* of scholia'), 156–161 ('Resetting the question: from types to texts'). Also see, Lundon, *Σχόλια* (1997), 73–86 (on the meaning of the term 'scholia' in antiquity).

119 On Symmachus, see Boudreaux, *op. cit*., 144–160; Gudeman, *Symmachos* (1931), 1136–1140. On Phaeinus, see White, *Scholia* (1914), LXVIII–LXIX.

120 On Didymus, see Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1892), II, 195–210; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung* (1907), 157–168; Boudreaux, *op. cit*., 91–137; Pfeiffer, *History* (1968), 274–279; West, *Chalcenteric Negligence* (1970), 288–296 (criticises Didymus' method of work and questions his reliability); Braswell, *Didymos* (2013), 27–103.

121 Commentaries to Aristophanes' comedies were written by Euphronios, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Callistratus, Aristarchus of Samothrace and Timachides of Rhodes (who only commented the *Frogs*). On ancient *ὑπομνήματα,* see Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare* (2002), 117–152.

122 See Cohn, *Ammonios* (1894), 1865–1866. On authors of works on persons mocked in comedies, cf. Steinhausen, *ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ* (1910).

our Byzantine redaction was born.[123] For it was in the 4th century AD that interest in Aristophanes was revived and his comedies were read by Julian the Apostate as well as the rhetoricians Themistius and Libanius, among others.[124]

In the late 1930s Günther Zuntz (1902–1992) published a comprehensive, two-part study[125] in which he argued that edition of comedies with extensive commentaries in the wide margins did not appear until the 9th century after the introduction of the Greek minuscule. [126] By then there were no *hypomnēmata*, which is why a Byzantine scholar had to rely on several published comedies with scholia, and that is how the archetype of later editions of Aristophanes' comedies emerged.[127] This view, in turn, started being questioned in the 1960s and 70s,[128] and today many scholars reject Zuntz's hypothesis.[129] This was particularly thanks to Nigel G. Wilson, who published several important articles on the history of scholia.[130] He attached great importance to an extant page of the Callimachus codex with marginal scholia (POxy 2258), written in a Coptic uncial of the 6th or 7th century AD.[131] Previously, Rudolf Pfeiffer (1889–1979) had contended that the scholia originated from several ὑπομνήματα.[132] Wilson also pointed to the richly illustrated

123 Thus for instance Dindorf, 'Praefatio', in Dübner, *Scholia* (1855), VI ab; White, *Scholia* (1914), LXIV–LXVII; Boudreaux, *op. cit*., 171–188.

124 See White, op. cit., LV–LVI. Themist. *Sophistēs* 289c [II 83 Downey-Norman]; Lib. *Or*. 1, 9; Iul. Ap. *Caesar*. 310 B; *Ep. ad Basil*. 381 A; *Ep. ad Hermog*. 374 A; *Ep. ad Themist*. 260 C; *Or*. 4 Bidez (*Or*. 8 Hertlein) 243 C.

125 Zuntz, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien* (1938), 631–690 and (1939), 545–614 = (1975). Cf. *idem*, *An Inquiry* (1965), 272–275.

126 On the shift from majuscule to minuscule writing, i.e. μεταχαρακτηρισμός, in 9th- and 10th-century Byzantium; see Mango, *L'origine de la minuscule* (1977), 175–179; Lemerle, *Byzantine Humanism* (1986), 121–136; Reynolds, Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (1991), 59–61.

127 Similarly Erbse, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* (1961), 213. Nevertheless, he later supported Wilson's view. Cf. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca* (1971), 547 'Cui (scil. Wilson) animo prompto paratoque assentior, dummodo liceat scholia in Iliadem excipere; nam haec nono demum saeculo conglutinata esse inveniuntur'.

128 E.g. Dover, *Aristophanes, Clouds* (1968), CXIV–CXV; Gelzer, *Aristophanes* (1970), 1561. Cf. Pfeiffer, *History* (1968), 270 n. 3.

129 E.g. Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare* (2002), 230–232; Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (2007), 28–30.

130 Wilson, *A Chapter in the History of Scholia* (1967), 244–256; *idem*, *Two Notes on Byzantine Scholarship* (1971), 557–560; *idem*, *Scoliasti e commmentatori* (1983), 83–112.

131 *Editio princeps* of POxy 2258 was published by E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XX, London 1952, 69–107 (p. 71: the papyrus was written around 500 or 600 AD).

132 Pfeiffer, *Callimachus, Opera* (1953), II, p. XXVII 'qui ea scholia in Aegypto composuit, ex ὑπομνημάτων voluminibus variam doctrinam collegit, complures ad eundem locum explicationes necnon aliorum scriptorum testimonia diligenter attulit'. McNamee, *Annotations in Greek*

De materia medica (Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς) codex by Dioscorides (1st century AD), at the *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* in Vienna (MS. med. gr. 1) from around 512, in whose wide margins at the bottom of the page the copyist entered pharmacological comments taken from the works of Galen (c. 129 – c. 199) and Crateuas (1st century BC). That is why he put forward the hypothesis that Aristophanes' comedies with scholia could have appeared before the 9th century, though he realised that his arguments were not entirely convincing.[133] In my opinion the stance of Herwig Maehler,[134] who defends G. Zuntz's hypothesis, is more sensible. He maintains that POxy 2258, in which the comments are written entirely in capital letters smaller than the main text, was an intermediate phase (*Vorstufen*) in the development of the book.[135] He adds that in the 9th and early 10th centuries the copyists were experimenting with various types of writing to see how much text they could fit on a page. There are extant manuscripts where the main text is written in minuscule while the marginal comments are written in small capitals. Only a fully developed minuscule with a system of abbreviations allowed for combining text with comments on a single page, and this did not occur until the 9th century.[136] The direct source of scholia to Aristophanes were not the ὑπομνήματα, but scholia of late antiquity. This is evidenced by a passage introduced with the word ἄλλως ('differently'), which is sometimes not an alternative explanation but a repetition of what was already said almost in the same words. This indicates that such scholia could not have originated from ὑπόμνημα, but from the combination of two scholia taken from two editions of a given comedy.[137]

---

and Latin Texts (2007), 128 stresses, however, that in earlier manuscripts there are no marginalia comprising two or more comments.

133 Wilson, *A Chapter* (1967), 249 'Despite the inconclusive nature of this discussion the possibility remains that in the late ancient world large codices containing text and copious scholia began to circulate'; *idem*, *Scholars of Byzantium* (1983), 34 'There are, however, several reasons for thinking that the old view which attributed the compilation of scholia to late antiquity was correct, and although none of them is decisive, collectively they make a strong case.' It seems to me that Wilson's stance contradicts the 9th philological rule of Karl Lehrs, cited above on p. XI.

134 Maehler, *Die Scholien der Papyri* (1994), 125–127.

135 See Zuntz, *An Inquiry* (1965), 274 n. ‡ 'but it is (scil. POxy 2258) no more, nor less, than a crude precursor of the latter (scil. the full marginal commentaries of the classical Byzantine type)'.

136 Maehler, *op. cit.*, 127 'Erst die voll ausgebildete kleine Buchminuskel mit ihrem Abkürzungssystem machte es möglich, Textausgabe und Kommentar auf einer Buchseite zu vereinigen. Diese Form der "Scholienhandschrift" ist daher kaum vor dem 9. Jahrhundert denkbar.'

137 See Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (1993), 97. Though there are scholars (e.g. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* [2007], 13) who suppose that some ὑπομνήματα to literary works did survive to the 9th century. On the other hand, it is a fact that comments to philosophical, medical and mathematical works have survived.

Recently the problem of the origins of scholia was considered by Fausto Montana.[138] He draws attention to the differences between the marginalia of late antiquity and medieval scholia, though there are also some discernible similarities.[139] He stresses that we know very little about the production and distribution of books in the 6th–8th centuries, not only in territories occupied by the Arabs, but also within the borders of the former Roman Empire during the so-called Dark Ages. For this reason one cannot assume that a single centre of learning contributed to the emergence of scholia (Wilson pointed to the 6th-century activities of scholars in Gaza). Montana maintains that the cultural need for books with scholia only really emerged during the first Byzantine Renaissance and that was when books with scholia started being produced. He rightly concludes that supporters of the theory that scholia date back to late antiquity lack convincing arguments to support their conjecture.[140]

The oldest extant Aristophanes codex (*Ravennas 429*) dates from the 10th century, but its scholia certainly differ from the archetype.[141] Scribes generally treated scholia in a more relaxed fashion than the main text and allowed convenience to dictate what form they should take. They were often abbreviated, carelessly copied and/or entered in the wrong place. Thus considerable differences occur between scholia to the same comedy. These were called *scholia vetera*. Another type, *scholia recentiora*, was created by Byzantine scholars. For instance, comments to Aristophanes' comedies were written by John Tzetzes (c. 1100–1180). These comments are of a lesser value, though one cannot rule out that he had access to now lost manuscripts and scholia.

Scholia therefore contain valuable fragments of the works of Alexandrian scholars (e.g. they refer to the works of Melanthius and Craterus), but they also include unreliable information as well as obvious mistakes.[142] I shall give a few examples: a) the Athenians attacked Melos because they considered its inhabitants to be atheists, which was indicated by the atheism of Diagoras (Σ^{E} *Nub*. 830 b = T 6 A); b) The Athenians considered Melians to be atheists, because Diagoras came from Melos (Σ^{E} *Nub*. 830 b = T 6 A), c) Socrates was a student of Diagoras (Σ^{E} *Nub*. 830 b = T 6 A), d) Diagoras introduced καινὰ δαιμόνια as did Socrates (Σ *Ran*. 320 a = T 8), e) Diagoras stopped being an atheist (ἄθεος ἦν τὸ πρότερον),

138 Montana, *The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora* (2011), 156–161.

139 Similarly McNamee, *Annotations* (2007), 128.

140 Montana, *op. cit*., 161 'Given the lack of concrete evidence, *argumenta e silentio* and other controvertible or inconclusive lines of reasoning ultimately prove to be unsatisfactory.'

141 Cf. Dickey, *op. cit*., 14–15.

142 See Wilson, *Scoliasti e commentatori* (1983), 96–100, who points to various mistakes made in scholia.

contrary to all of ancient tradition (Suda s.v. πυργίσκοι = T 67 B).[143] Therefore, it seems surprising that certain scholars attach so much importance to information found in scholia to the *Birds* 1073 (T 7 A). There the scholiast, citing Craterus, writes that a decree was issued against Diagoras more or less at the time of the capture of Melos. He next writes a short sentence, stating that nothing prevented dating the decree earlier (οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει πρότερον). Above all, we do not know whether this information actually came from Craterus or whether this was the unsubstantiated speculation of the scholiast. In my opinion, we cannot base any bold hypothesis on such an enigmatic sentence which contradicts what other sources say about Diagoras.

8. The Arabic tradition

The Arabic translation movement emerged and developed in the Abbasid Caliphate, from c. 750 to c. 950. It began to decline after the Būyid dynasty came to power and ended around the year 1000.[144] The translating tradition flourished in the 9th century, when a group of translators in Baghdad was headed by the outstanding Nestorian physician Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq (808–873).[145] Translated in particular were works on philosophy and sciences, such as medicine, astronomy and mathematics. Information on Diagoras is found in the works of four Arab authors.

143 Although Janko (*The Physicist* [1997], 91 and *The Derveni Papyrus* [2001], 11 n. 41) corrected the scholion text by adding the negation οὐκ, I feel such an intervention into an ancient text is unjustified, since scholia include very diverse types of errors.

144 A new approach to the problem has been presented by Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture* (1998). Rejecting many previously held views, his arguments include: a) already Caliph al-Manṣūr, who founded Baghdad in 762, supported the translation movement because he had accepted Zoroastrian Sassanian imperial ideology, according to which translation of Greek works was the recovery of knowledge contained in the Avesta, which Alexander the Great had ordered to be burned, b) the House of Wisdom (*bait al-ḥikma*) had nothing to do with the translation movement, c) the development of Arab philosophy and science contributed to the translation of Greek texts, not the other way around. Cf. Gutas, *Die Wiedergeburt der Philosophie* (2012), 55–91.

145 Eight papers on the Baghdad translation school are in Strohmaier's book *Von Demokrit bis Dante* (1996), 191–277. Cf. Ullmann, *Die Medizin* (1970), 115–119; Gutas, *Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq* (2012), 480–496. We should add that Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq often translated Greek works into Syriac and his co-workers next translated the Syriac texts into Arabic. On translations from Greek into Syriac, see Daiber, *Semitische Sprachen* (1986), 298–306; Endress, *Die wissenschaftliche Literatur* (1987), 407–412; Troupeau, *Le rôle des syriaques* (1991), 1–10; Hugonnard-Roche, *Le mouvement des traductions syriaques* (2011), 45–77.

A. Abū l-Wafāʾ al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik

Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik[146] was an 11th-century Arab historian and philosopher. Although born in Damascus, he spent most of his life in Egypt. In 1048/49 he wrote *Muḫtār al-ḥikam wa maḥāsin al kalim* (*Choicest Maxims and Best Sayings*). It chiefly includes the sayings of Greek philosophers, which are preceded by biographical information about the author of each saying and descriptions of their character. A passage on Diagoras (= T 10) is found in a chapter on Zeno of Elea, founder of the Eleatic school.[147] The biography of Zeno was inserted by Muhammad ibn Mahmūd aš-Šahrazūrī (13th century) in his work *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa rawdat al-afrāḥ* (*Amusement of the Souls and Garden of Delights*), which presented the history of philosophers from Adam to Galen.[148]

A German translation of the biography of Zeno, based on two Mubaššir codices and a Šahrazūrī's text, was published by Franz Rosenthal (1914–2003) in 1937.[149] The biography of Diagoras was later translated into other languages.[150] It probably also exists in as yet unpublished Persian translations of Šahrazūrī's work.[151] Mubaššir's work was translated into several European languages during the Middle Ages (13th–15th century) and was very popular.[152] The Arabic text reach the court of King Alfonso the Wise (1252–1284), where by 1257 it was already translated into Spanish (*Bocados de oro*).[153] By the end of the 13th century the Spanish version was translated into Latin and entitled *Liber philosophorum moralium antiquorum*.[154] Next, before 1402,

146 See Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1937), 829; Rosenthal, *Arabische Nachrichten* (1937), 24–29; Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1943), 600; Rosenthal, *Al-Mubashshir* (1960/61), 136–138; Cottrell, *Al-Mubashshir* (2011), 815–818.

147 The entire work was published by A. Badawi (Madrid 1958). Part of the work (without the Zeno biography) in Rosenthal, *The Classical Heritage* (1992), 124–144. The sayings of Diogenes of Sinope were translated by Gutas, *Sayings by Diogenes* (1993), 485–513 and Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 144–153.

148 Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1937), 850–851; Rosenthal, *Arabische Nachrichten* (1937), 27–28; Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1943), 617; Rosenthal, *Al-Mubashshir* (1960/61), 147–148; Cottrell, *al Shahrazūrī* (2011), 1190–1194.

149 Rosenthal, *Arabische Nachrichten* (1937), 30–35. Por. Cottrell, *Notes* (2008), 538–541.

150 English: Jacoby, FGrHist III b Suppl. I, 1954, 198; G.J. van Gelder in Bremmer, *Religious Secrets* (1995), 74–75 (only part of the text); French: Aouad, *Diagoras* (1994), 752–753; Latin: Winiarczyk, *Diagorae Melii* (1981), 5–6 (T 10).

151 Rosenthal, *Al- Mubashshir* (1960/61), 148.

152 Rosenthal, *op. cit*., 133–136, 149–155.

153 Two publications exist: Knust, *Mittheilungen aus dem Eskurial* (1879), 69–394; Crombach, *Bocados de Oro* (1971).

154 Published by Franceschini, *Liber* (1932), 398–588.

the Latin text was translated into French by Guillaume de Tignonville.[155] In the 15th century the French version was translated into Provençal and several times into English.[156] Most famous of these was a translation made by Earl Rivers between 1473 and 1477 (*The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*). In 1477 it was published by William Caxton (1420–1492), England's first printer. It is worth adding that this was the first English language book to be printed with a date and colophon.[157]

In the Spanish and Latin texts I have not found any mention of Diagoras. It turns out that the first translator abridged the biography of Zeno of Elea to the tale of how he was tortured but refused to reveal the names of his colleagues. The translators decision is quite understandable, because that part of the philosopher's life story would have been of the greatest interest to the average reader. A similar editorial decision was made by the Persian writer Mīrhwānd (†1498), who in his book *Raudatu' s-safā* (*Garden of Purity*) relied on Šahrazūrī's work.[158]

F. Rosenthal assumed that Al-Mubaššir relied on the Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία by the Neoplatonist Porphyry of Tyre (c. 234–c. 305),[159] but admitted that the Arab could not have had access to the original Greek text. Instead he relied on a translation into Arabic by a Syrian who made many alterations to the original Greek text.[160] Rosenthal's view was disputed by Franz Altheim (1898–1976) and Ruth Stiehl, who maintained that there is no evidence to prove Al-Mubaššir actually relied on a biography of Zeno from Porphyry's work. They argued that in his Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία Porphyry had indeed written about seven great philosophers from Thales to Plato, but that Zeno of Elea was not among them. Hence, it did not seem likely that a detailed description of the life of Zeno of Elea would be found

155 The edition of Eder, *Tignonvillana inedita* (1915), 908–1019.

156 Rosenthal, *op. cit*., 134 and 152.

157 I used a facsimile of W. Caxton's *editio princeps* (London, 1877).

158 Rosenthal, *Arabische Nachrichten* (1937), 25 n. 1.

159 Rosenthal, *op. cit*., 39–40, 56. Rosenthal, *Al-Mubashshir* (1960/61), 135–136 considers it possible that Al-Mubaššir relied directly on *Nawādir al-falāsifah* by Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq, but adds that 'proof is needed that this was so'. However, already Merkle, *Die Sittensprüche* (1921), 18–19 maintained that this problem cannot be resolved. Cf. Rosenthal, *Sayings* (1958), 154–155 ('Al-Mubaššir and Ibn Durayd'). Fragments of *Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία* have survived chiefly in: *Graecarum affectionum curatio* by Theodoret of Cyrus († 460) and *Contra Iulianum* by Cyril of Alexandria († 444). Cf. Segonds, *Les Fragments* (1982), 163–169. Publications: FGrHist 260 F 4–24; A. Smith, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1993, 220–248.

160 On knowledge of *Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία* among Arab writers, see Altheim, Stiehl, *Porphyrios* (1954), 7–26; Dunlop, *The Muntakhab Siwān al- ḥikmah* (1979), XXII; Segonds, *op. cit*., 169–176. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al Fihrist* (II 610 Dodge = T 194a Smith) maintained he saw bk. 4 of a Syriac version of Porphyry's work.

in Porphyry's work.[161] A few years later, however, these same scholars assumed that Al-Mubaššir's book had contained fragments from Porphyry's work, and referred readers to Rosenthal's article.[162] It seems that they changed their minds and accepted Rosenthal's hypothesis. His theory was also considered probable by several other scholars.[163] Ilona Opelt (1928–1991) also maintained that Porphyry had influenced Al-Mubaššir, though she did not cite Rosenthal's article.[164] In my opinion, one cannot rule out an indirect reliance of Al-Mubaššir on Porphyry's work, but a more likely hypothesis is that he relied on the work of an Arabian author (cf. n. 160). Either way, an Arabic text will not help us reconstruct the original version of Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία.

F. Jacoby believed that Porphyry relied on a Βίοι φιλοσόφων compilation when writing the lives of philosophers, and the ages of the philosophers he took from the *Chronicle* by Apollodorus of Athens or at least from a textbook using the chronologies of Eratosthenes/Apollodorus.[165] Even if we accept this view, we have to admit that the date of Diagoras' conviction provided by Al-Mubaššir originates from the same chronological tradition as was referred to by Diodorus Siculus. Therefore, the Arabic account does not provide us with a new argument to support the theory that Diagoras was convicted in 415.

B. Ibn Durayd

Ibn Durayd (837–933), a famous philologist and lexicographer,[166] was the author of *Kitāb al- Muğtanā* (*Book of Harvest*), which included the sayings of Muhammad and his successors as well as the apophthegmata of ancient philosophers and didactic verses. The sayings of seventy-four Greeks were published by Franz Rosenthal, adding English translations and equivalent Greek texts if such survived.[167] No. 67 speaks of a statue of Heracles being cast into the fire (p. 51: trans-

161 Altheim, Stiehl, *Porphyrios* (1954), 19–21. Similarly, Segonds, *op. cit.*, 170 'sans preuve absolument déterminante'.

162 Altheim, Stiehl, *New Fragments* (1961), 4.

163 Kraemer, *Arabische Homerverse* (1956), 276–277 n. 3; Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 13; Walzer, *Furfūriyūs* (1965), 949; *idem*, *Porphyry* (1965), 283; Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 154.

164 Opelt, *Die griechische Philosophie* (1970), 30.

165 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 13 ll. 11–12, 20 ll. 21–24, 39 n. 140. Similarly, Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 188.

166 Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1937), 172–174; *idem*, *Geschichte* (1943), 112–114; Fück, *Ibn Durayd* (1971), 757–758.

167 Rosenthal, *Sayings* (1958), 29–54, 150–183. He reprinted a text originally published by F. Krenkow (Heyderabad, 1923), to which I had no access.

lation, p. 181: Arabic text), but the culprit is not named. On the other hand, seven Greek authors attribute the anecdote to Diagoras[168] (see chap. IV 5 A). F. Rosenthal[169] assumed that Ibn Durayd had taken the anecdote from a Greek florilegium that had already been translated into Arabic by some Christian who ascribed it to the known jokester Stratonicus, 410–360.[170] Although the anecdote did not bear the name Stratonicus (only the statement 'Once, when he was cooking'), Rosenthal maintained that since Nos. 64–65 were ascribed to Stratonicus, and Nos. 68–69 to Simonides (i.e. Ibn Hindu relied on Ibn Durayd, who does not include the name Simonides), No. 67 had to concern Stratonicus. I must admit I find Rosenthal's line of reasoning unconvincing. He examined three different Arabic florilegia and the work of Al-Mubaššir, but nowhere did he find an anecdote about the burning of the Heracles statue.[171] Many Arabic florilegia are yet to be published, which is why we cannot rule out the possibility that this particular source might yet reveal our anecdote.[172]

Oliver Overwien has convincingly explained why Greek sayings were generally passed on to in the Arabic world.[173] Gnomes appeared in Arabic poetry already before the emergence of Islam, and naturally with Islam the sayings of the prophet Muhammad also became very popular. Just as in the Greek world (e.g. in Aelian's *Varia historia*), so too among Arabs (in Adab literature) gnomes and *apophthegmata* served an educational and moralising role, but were also valued as pure entertainment. Many sayings simply expressed general truths (e.g. the value of friendship, respect for one's parents or the dangers that occur in human life) that were accepted in both cultures. Although some of the sayings of Diogenes of Sinope shocked the Arabs, they nevertheless appreciated their ascetic

168 Athenag. *Leg*. 4 (T 27); Cl. Al. *Protr*. II 24, 4 (T 63); Epiph. *Anc*. 103, 8 (T 28); *Schol. Arist. Nub*. 830 g (T 6 A); *Schol. Ael. Arist. ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 258* (T 31); Tzetzes, *Comment. Arist. Nub*. 829 a (T 11); Tzetzes, *Chil*. XIII 374–384 (T 32). It is ascribed to Diogenes in *Theos. Tub*. 70 (T 29), and to Euripides in *Corp. Paris*. 6, 48 and *Gnom. Vat*. 276 (T 30).

169 Rosenthal, *Sayings* (1958), 157.

170 See Maas, *Stratonikos* (1931), 326–327.

171 Rosenthal, *Sayings* (1958), 150–156.

172 On Arabic gnomologies and florilegia, see Merkle, *Die Sittensprüche* (1921), esp. 16–35; Kraemer, *Arabische Homerverse* (1956), 287–316; Strohmaier, *Ethical Sentences* (1971), 463–471, reprint in: *idem*, *Von Demokrit* (1996), 44–52; Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature* (1975), 36–55; Dunlop, *The Muntakhab Siwān al-ḥikmah* (1979), IX–XXXI; Esbroeck, *Les sentences morales* (1986), 11–23; Strohmaier, *Das Gnomologium* (1998), 461–471, reprint in: *idem*, *Hellas im Islam* (2003), 43–49; Overwien, *Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq, Ādāb al- falāsifa* (2003), 95–115; Strohmaier, *Die Weisheit des kleinen Mannes*, in Piccione, Perkams (ed.), *Selecta colligere* (2003), 3–16; Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 94–166; Gutas, *Gnomologien* (2012), 463–470; Pietruschka, *Das Corpus* (2014), 291–302.

173 Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 193–209.

nature. The self-sufficiency and self-mastery of the cynics was reminiscent of the asceticism practiced in Sufism, and some of the sayings of the cynics even found their way into Sufi literature.

C. Qustā ibn Lūqā

Pseudo-Plutarch's (c. 150 AD) doxographic handbook *Placita philosophorum* (880 D = T 47), which is an epitome of Aëtius' *Placita*,[174] was translated into Arabic (*Kitāb al-ārāʾ al-ṭabīʿya*) by Qustā ibn Lūqā (c. 820 – c. 912) probably in the mid–9th century.[175] Qustā ibn Lūqā was a Christian born in the Syrian city of Baalbek, who was fluent in Greek, Syriac and Arabic. The translations he made in Baghdad were highly valued by the Arabs.[176] His translation of *Placita philosophorum* was known, directly or indirectly, to many Arab authors.[177] Apart from Diagoras, its *index atheorum* (I 7, 1) also mentions Theodorus of Cyrene and Euhemerus of Tegea.[178]

D. Pseudo Al-Ǧāḥiẓ

In the work entitled *Kitāb ad-dalāʾil wa-l-iʾtibār ʿala l-ḫalq wa-t-tadbir* (*Book on the Signs and the Meditation upon [God's] Creation and [His] Rule*) Diagoras and Epicurus are refuted by Aristotle and other philosophers.[179] The book was earlier

174 On the doxographic tradition, see Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (1879), 1–263; Wyss, *Doxographie* (1959), 197–210; Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana I* (1997); Bremmer, *Aëtius* (1998), 154–160; Frede, *Aëtiana* (1999), 135–149; Runia, *What Is Doxography* (1999), 33–55; Zhmud, *Revising Doxography* (2001), 219–243 (a critique of the book by Mansfeld, Runia, *Aetiana I*); Mansfeld, *Deconstructing Doxography* (2002), 277–286 (a reply to Zhmud's criticism); Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana II* (2009); Runia, *Aëtius* (2009), 464–470, reprint in: Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana III* (2010), 173–180; Zhmud, *Die doxographische Tradition* (2013), 150–174; Bottler, *Pseudo-Plutarch und Stobaios* (2014); Strohmaier, *Doxography* (2015), 83–87.

175 The translation of *Placita* is mentioned by Ibn an-Nadīm in his work (*Kitāb al-Fihrist*) which was created c. 987. See Dodge, *The Fihrist* (1970), II, 611.

176 Brockelmann, *Geschichte* (1937), 365–366; *idem*, *Geschichte* (1943), 222–224; Graf, *Geschichte* (1947), II, 30–32; Sezgin, *Geschichte* (1970), III, 270–274; *idem*, *Geschichte* (1974), V, 285–286; Daiber, *Aëtius Arabus* (1980), 3–6.

177 Daiber, *op. cit.*, 85–88. Cf. Diels, *Doxographi* (1879), 27–28; Badawi, *La transmission* (1968), 114–115. The Arabic text with a German translation was published by Daiber, *op. cit.*, 92–249.

178 On catalogues of atheists, see chap. IV 1.

179 Daiber, *Possible Echoes* (2014), 173. Cf. *idem*, *Das theologisch-philosophische System* (1975), 161–162, n. 8.

attributed to the outstanding Arab scholar Al-Ǧāḥiẓ (777–869), who was active in Basra and supported the Muʿtazilites.[180] Hans Daiber claims, however, that it was written by the Nestorian Christian author Ǧibrīl Ibn Nūḥ Ibn Abī Nūḥ an-Naṣrānī al-Anbāri (9th century).[181]

180 See Pellat, *Al-Djāḥiẓ* (1965), 395–398; *idem*, *Arabische Geisteswelt* (1967), esp. 11–49 ('Leben und Werk Al-Ǧāḥiẓ'). I had no access to the edition of Muḥammad Rāghib aṭ-Ṭabbākh, Aleppo 1928, nor to two translations: A. Caruso, *Il libro dei moniti e della riflessione*, Napoli 1991 (Istituto Universitario Orientale. Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici. Series Minor 38); M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, *Chance or Creation? God's Design in the Universe*, Berkshire 1995.

181 Daiber, *Possible Echoes* (2014), 172.

III. The Life of Diagoras

1. Dating

The Greek chronologists give two different dates for Diagoras' ἀκμή: 468/467[1] and 482/481[2]. They synchronise him with either the poets or the philosophers. As a poet, he was a contemporary of Simonides and Pindar[3] as well as Bacchylides.[4] Al-Mubaššir (T 10), on the other hand, dates Diagoras as a contemporary of the following philosophers: Leucippus, Zeno of Elea, Empedocles, Melissus, Protagoras, Anaxagoras, Socrates and Democrates (= Democritus).[5] Testimonies provide yet more facts from the life of Diagoras. He is supposed to have helped the former boxer Nicodorus to draft laws for the inhabitants of Mantinea in the Peloponnese (Ael. *Var. hist*. II 23 = T 13). The Mantinean legislation is assumed to have been introduced around the year 425.[6] In Aristophanes' *Clouds* 830, performed in 423, Socrates is called the Melian (Μήλιος),[7] on account of his apparent belief that

1 Eus. Hier. *Chron*., Ol. 78, 1 (T 5 A); cf. Suda s.v. Διαγόρας 523 (Ol. 78) [T 9 A].

2 Eus. Hier. *Chron*., Ol. 74, 3 (T 1 A); cf. Cyr. Al. *C. Iul*. I 15 (Ol. 74) [SCh 322, 134 = T 2].

3 *Schol. Arist. Ran*. 320 (T 8); Tzetzes, *Comment. Arist. Ran*. 320a (T 12).

4 Eus. Hier. *Chron*. Ol. 78, 1 (T 5 A); cf. T 5 B. According to the Suda (T 9 A) Diagoras lived after Pindar and Bacchylides but was older than Melanippides. Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 13 ll. 35–37 nevertheless, supported the variant Μελανιππίδης δὲ περεσβύτερος. See n. 35.

5 On Al-Mubaššir's account, see chap. II 8 A. Other testimonia link Diagoras with the philosophers: Eus. Hier. *Chron*. p. 109, 3 Helm (T 1 A); Eus. *Chron. vers. Armen*. p. 191 Karst (T 1 B); Ps.-Dionys. Telmah. *Chron*. p. 29 Siegfried-Gelzer (T 1 C); Syncell. *Ecl. chronogr*. 483 p. 305 Mosshammer (T 3); Excerpta Lat. Barb. p. 264 Frick (T 4).

6 Thus Fougères, *Mantinée* (1898), 381; Derenne, *Les procès d'impiété* (1930), 63; Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 418. Bölte, *Mantineia* (1930), 1319–1320 suggested 425–423, whereas Jacoby, *op. cit*., 18 ll. 44–45 opted for 426/425. Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 172–173, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 73–74 supported 457/456, i.e. when Athens was extending its influence in the Peloponnese. On the stance of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, see n. 13.

7 The philosopher Hippo was also called a Melian (Cl. Al. *Protr*. II 24, 2 Διαγόραν καὶ Ἵππωνα τὼ Μηλίω – T 63; Arnob. *Adv. nat*. IV 29 *Hippone ac Diagora Meliis* – T 64). Fabricius, *Bibliotheca* (1791), II, 658 and Bergk, *Commentationum* (1838), 168 and 178 believed that Hippo was called a Melian because he espoused the same views as the atheist Diagoras. It should be added there are several places where Hippo was said to have been born (Samos, Rhegium and Metapontum), but never Melos. See Zeller, Nestle, *Die Philosophie* (1923), I 1, 333 n. 4. Although only two Christian authors maintain that Diagoras and Hippo were Melian, other writers also place their names next to each other (Plut. *De comm. not*. 31, 1075 A – T 53; Ael. *Nat. anim*. VI 40 – T 58; Ael. *Var. hist*. II 31 – T 60; Ael. fr. 33 Hercher = fr. 36 Domingo Forasté = Suda s.v. ἔρρε – T 59; Simplic. *In Arist. De caelo* I 3 – T 66). This suggests that Clement of Alexandria and Arnobius had passed on an earlier tradition. We should, nevertheless, add that the τὼ Μηλίω variant in Clement's

Zeus did not exist and that the world was ruled by the Vortex (Δῖνος). This is a clear allusion to Diagoras, who at the time must have been well known in Athens as a θεομάχος.[8]

Diodorus Siculus (XIII 6, 7 – T 17) and Al-Mubaššir (T 10) state that Diagoras was accused of impiety during the archonship of Charias, in 415/414, and that that was when he fled from Athens. On the other hand, according to a scholion to Aristophanes' *Birds* 1073 (T 7 A), this was to have occurred during the capture of Melos, i.e. in 416/415. In his comedy the *Birds* 1073–1074 (T 15), performed in 414, Aristophanes speaks of a decree that awarded one talent for the murder of the fugitive Diagoras. However, it is wrong to assume that Diagoras was already mentioned by Hermippus in his comedy Μοῖραι, which was performed in 430,[9] or that Aristophanes referred to him in his comedy the *Frogs* 320 in 405.[10]

Already at first glance one can see that Diagoras' ἀκμή cannot correspond to the year of his conviction, as by then he would have been at least over 90 years old. This problem was solved by Felix Jacoby, who proposed that the chronologists were not stating Diagoras' ἀκμή, but the date of his birth.[11] He drew attention to the ambiguity of the word γέγονε, which often led to misunderstandings.[12] Jacoby's hypothesis has been rightly accepted by other scholars.[13]

---

text is the conjecture of Robert Münzel (1859–1917), adopted by Otto Stählin (1868–1949) in his edition of Clement of Alexandria's work. In the manuscripts the phrase is Διαγόραν καὶ Ἵππωνα τὸν Μήλιον, and Hermann Diels (1848–1922) rearranged the order, so that it reads Ἵππωνα καὶ Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον. However, I feel Luria, *Democritea* (1970), 387 and 404 is wrong to see an allusion to Diagoras' atheism in the phrase Λεύκιππος ὁ Μήλιος (= DK 67 A 1 ap. Diog. Laert. IX 30). Μήλιος is a corrupted variant. The appropriate form would be Μιλήσιος, since Leucippus was from Miletus (cf. DK 67 A 8, 12, 33).

8 See chap. II 2 A, where *Clouds* II is discussed.

9 Hermip. fr. 43 Kassel-Austin (PCG V 580). See chap. II 1.

10 See chap. II 2 C.

11 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 15 ll. 28–29, 35 n. 77, 36 n. 90. Some scholars accepted the transmitted *akmē* date and therefore rejected Diodorus' testimony (XIII 6, 7 – T 17), which spoke of the Diagoras' escape from Athens in 415/414. This view was held, e.g. by Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1845), 180; Münchenberg, *De Diagora* (1877), 14–16; Müller-Strübing, *Protagorea* (1880), 92–93. They assumed that Diodorus had confused Diagoras with Protagoras.

12 See Rohde, *Γέγονε* (1878), 161–220, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften* (1901), 114–184.

13 Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 123; Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 190. Although Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 83 and *idem*, *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), 426 n. 4 tried to defend this tradition, his explanation is highly improbable and based on unprovable hypotheses. He argued that Diagoras' *akmē* was dated too early (similarly Drachmann, *Atheism* [1922], 156 and Derenne, *Les procès d'impiété* [1930], 70). In 468 Diagoras was to have composed an epinikion in honour of Nicodorus, who was victorious in a boxing agon (similarly Derenne, *op. cit*., 57). Some 50 years later, Nicodorus, with Diagoras' assistance, was drafting the constitution of

I believe it is possible to convincingly explain why Diagoras' ἀκμή (in fact his birth date) coincided with the 74th (484/481) or 78th (468/465) Olympiad. According to the Χρονικά by Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BC), which is considered the source of dates in the work of Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 265–c. 340) and the *Suda* (10th century), Protagoras of Abdera and Empedocles of Acragas were born and Heraclitus of Ephesus died during the 74th Games, i.e. 40 years before the founding of the colony in Thurii (in the first year of the 84th Olympiad, i.e. 444/443).[14] Diagoras was probably synchronised with Protagoras, who was also accused of impiety.[15] They are frequently mentioned together and sometimes one is confused with the other.[16] Moreover, it was most probably presumed that Diagoras' atheism implied an association with the natural philosophers. From this one may conclude that 'dating is a flimsy construction, depending on philosophical and chronological inferences from Diagoras' notorious atheism'.[17]

Now let us consider the second date, which links Diagoras with the poets (see n. 4). Simonides of Ceos died during the first year of the 78th Olympiad (468). According to Leonard Woodbury, this date probably marks the ἀκμή of Bacchylides, who was the successor of Simonides.[18] Also Diagoras, synchronised with Bacchylides, was probably dated in association with this event. That Diagoras' ἀκμή was confused with the date of his birth is probably evident in the *Suda* (T 9 A), which states that Diagoras lived after Pindar and Bacchylides (see n. 4). Therefore neither of the given dates is credible, since both stem from the mere

---

the Mantinean polis, and in 415 Diagoras was convicted for impiety. Wilamowitz's explanation was rightly criticised by Jacoby, *op. cit*., 35 n. 77, 43 n. 186.

14 On the method applied by Apollodorus, see Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (1902), 39–59; Mosshammer, *The Chronicle* (1979), 113–127.

15 See Piccirilli, *Il primo caso di autodafé* (1997), 17–23; Capra, *Platone e la storia* (2000), 19–37; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 157–166; Lenfant, *Protagoras et son procès* (2002), 135–154; Corradi, *L'origine della tradizione sul processo* (2007), 285–301; *idem*, *Protagora* (2012), 31–43; Rubel, *Fear* (2014), 64–68, 210–212. The historicity of the trial is rejected by the scholars mentioned in the Preface, n. 4, and include von Fritz, *Protagoras* (1957), 909–911; Müller, *Protagoras über die Götter* (1967), 148–159, reprint in: Classen (Hrsg.), *Sophistik* (1976), 323–339 (the tradition dates back to the Attidograph Philochorus); Schiappa, *Protagoras* (2003), 144. See my methodological comments in the Preface (points 1b and 3).

16 Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 188; Winiarczyk, *Ad Athen. Dipnosoph. XIII 92* (1974),164–166; von Fritz, *Zur 'Rettung' des Protagoras* (1983), 67.

17 Woodbury, *l.c*.

18 Dating Bacchylides' *akmē* to 468 is supported by the fact that at the time he lauded the victor of a four-horse chariot race sponsored in Olympia by Hiero, the tyrant of Syracuse. Thus Körte, *Bacchylidea* (1918), 141 n. 3; Severyns, *Bacchylide* (1933), 27. On epinikion 3, see Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* (1997), 32–39; Reichel, *Zum literarischen* (2000), 147–159.

speculations of ancient chronologists. In Al-Mubaššir we find both datings. He synchronises Diagoras with the philosophers (ἀκμή 482/481), but states that the impiety indictment was during the archonship of Charias (i.e. 415/414), and also that Diagoras spent fifty four years in Pellene after his escape from Athens. Those fifty-four years, which is exactly the number of years between the supposed ἀκμή linking Diagoras with the poets (468/467) and the archonship of Charias (415/414), also probably matches the entire lifespan of Diagoras.[19] One thing is certain: Diagoras was born in the 5th century.

Under no circumstances is justified Italo Lana's statement that Diagoras was born around the year 530,[20] for in that case he would have lived in the times of Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar. Around 505–495 he would have overthrown the ἱππεῖς government in Eretria, and before 457/456 left Athens. That same year he would have helped Nicodorus draft a democratic constitution in Mantinea. He would have died before 446, since that was when the Eretrians came under Athenian rule. Therefore they could not have raised a statue in honour of Diagoras, who had died in Corinth. Lana came to such a reconstruction of the Melian's life, because he erroneously assumed that Aristotle (*Polit*. V 6, 1306a – T 89) and Heraclides Lembus (*De reb. publ*. fr. 40 Dilts – T 90) were referring to Diagoras of Melos and not to Diagoras of Eretria (see chap. III 2, p. 58).

2. Curriculum vitae

Diagoras, born on the island of Melos,[21] was the son of Teleclytus or Telecleides.[22] According to the *Suda*, Democritus released Diagoras from slavery for

19 Thus Jacoby, *op. cit*., 15 ll. 32–33.

20 Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 174 and 183, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 74 and 82.

21 Only Tatian, *Or. ad Gr.* 27 (T 68) calls Diagoras Ἀθηναῖος. Some of the manuscripts of Eus. Hier. *Chron*., Ol. 78, 1 (T 5 A) use the word *atheneus* instead of *atheus*. Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (1993), 233, stated that '"Diagoras" is a common enough name in the Aegean generally, but very rare at Athens'. On appearances of the name Diagoras, see Fraser *et al*., *A Lexicon* (1987–2014), I–V (s.v. Διαγόρας). Cf. Kirchner, *Prosopographia* (1966), I, 254 (Nos. 3740–3742); Trail, *Persons* (1996), V, 300–301 (Nos. 323180–323260);

22 Teleclytus: *Schol. Arist. Ran*. 320 (T 8); Tzetzes, *Comment. in Arist. Ranas* 320 a (T 12). Teleclytus or Telecleides: Suda s.v. Διαγόρας (T 9 A). According to Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 37–38 n. 108, Teleclytus 'is a somewhat rarer name, whereas the Telecleides name may be due to a confusion with the comic poet' (PCG VII, 667–692). On the other hand, Gigon, *Il libro 'Sugli dèi'* (1985), 422 n. 8, believes this was 'una semplice variante del nome', as in the case of Anaxagoras (Diog. Laert. II 6: Egesibulos or Eubulos), and that Jacoby's hypothesis 'è superflua'.

the sum of ten thousand drachmas and made him his pupil.[23] The information about Diagoras' slavery may originate from an anecdotal tradition that linked Diagoras with the capture of Melos.[24] However, the statement that Diagoras was a student of Democritus is also untrue,[25] as was the information that his pupil was Protagoras of Abdera.[26] Working as a porter, the future sophist was said to have invented a knot (τύλη) for the easier carrying of wood, and this was noticed by Democritus, who made him his secretary (γραφεύς).[27] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff[28] assumed that the fictitious story about Protagoras contributed to the creation of an analogous legend regarding Diagoras. This was all the easier because some writers in antiquity also considered Protagoras to have been an atheist.[29] Moreover, we read in Athenaeus' Δειπνοσοφισταί (c. 200 AD) that Diag-

23 Suda s.v. Διαγόρας (T 9 A) = Democrit. DK 68 A 10 a.

24 See chap. II 2 B, n. 36. Cf. Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1845), 181 'forsitan cum Meli expugnatione cohaeret dubia Diagorae servitus'; Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 35 n. 61, believes the anecdote is 'a rather harmless autoschediasma of a scholiast', but should be considered 'a deliberate invention'.

25 The ancient tradition was wrongly accepted by: Curtius, *Griechische Geschichte* (1880), III, 58; Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 132 and Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 59. Its truth was doubted by: Zeller, Nestle, *Die Philosophie* (1920), I 2, 1194; Praechter, *Die Philosophie* (1926), 129 and Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 13 ll. 27–28. In turn, Lana, *Studi* (1973), 67 n. 18, supposed that the legend connected Democritus with Diagoras because both were considered merciless mockers ('Democrito è ricordato come derisore di tutto e di tutti'; 'Diagora è noto come mottegiatore impenitente e schernitore senza pietà'), which does not seem very likely.

26 DK 80 A 1 ap. Diog. Laert. IX 50. On the emergence of this legend, see von Fritz, *Protagoras* (1957), 911–912; Steckel, *Demokritos* (1970), 193; Gigon, *Il libro 'Sugli dèi'* (1985), 420–422. Cf. Guthrie, *A History* (1965), II, 386 n. 2; Kerferd, Flashar, *Die Sophistik* (1998), 28–29. Not very convincing is the view presented by Woodbury, 201–202, that the anecdote was invented 'to demonstrate the dependence of all atheists upon the atomism of Democritus'. See chap. IV 4 B.

27 Protag. (DK 80 A 1) ap. Diog. Laert. IX 53 (= Aristot. fr. 72 Gigon = fr. 63 Rose) φορμοφόρος; Democr. (DK 68 A 9) ap. Athen. VIII 50, 354 c (= Epicur. fr. 172 Usener) φορμοφόρος καὶ ξυλοφόρος; Gell. V 3 *animi aciem sollertiamque hominis non docti demiratus*. See Corradi, *Protagora facchino* (2005), 392–412; *idem*, *Protagora* (2012), 15–31 ('L'invenzione del cercine').

28 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschgichte* (1900), 82 n. 2 'es ist Verwechslung mit einer bekannten Fabel über Protagoras'. Similarly Jacoby, op. cit., 45 n. 220 'the badly attested connection of Diagoras with Demokritos is merely due to a confusion of the former with Protagoras'. He nevertheless thought it possible (*op. cit.*, 13 ll. 30–34) that the history was invented by a comedy playwright in the 4th century BC.

29 Protagoras as an atheist: Diog. Oen. fr. 16 Smith (T 62); Theoph. Ant. *Ad Autol.* III 7; Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 55; Eus. *Praep. ev.* XIV 3, 7; Epiph. *De fide* 9, 20 (III 506 Holl); Aug. *C. litt. Pet.* III 21, 25 (T 87 A – cf. critical apparatus in my edition); Cyr. Al. *C. Iul.* VI 189 (T 20 – cf. critical apparatus in my edition).

oras had died in a maritime disaster.[30] Olof Gigon (1912–1998) assumed that the Epicurean tradition deliberately ascribed two students to Democritus, both of whom were accused of atheism.[31] However, it does not seem very probable that a reason for this legend would be the existence of a musician called Democritus of Chios, who was a contemporary of Diagoras.[32]

We know nothing about Diagoras' teacher of music. F. Jacoby presumed it was Melanippides the Elder,[33] who according to *Marmor Parium* (FGrHist 239 A 47) won a victory at Athens in 494/493, and the *Suda* dates his ἀκμή (i.e. date of birth) to the 65th Olympiad (i.e. 520/517).[34] Although we cannot rule out this possibility, it is difficult to justify it convincingly.[35]

It is not possible to determine precisely when Diagoras left his home island and became a travelling lyric poet, receiving commissions to write various works, such as dithyrambs, encomia, paeans and perhaps epinikia.[36] He stayed for some

30 Winiarczyk, *Ad Athen. Dipnosoph. XIII 92 p. 611 A-B* (1974), 164–166. I defended the text passed on in the manuscripts (Διαγόρας ἐφυγαδεύθη· ὅτε καὶ πλέων ναυαγίῳ ἐχρήσατο), trying to show that the conjecture introduced to the text by Wilamowitz is unnecessary. In antiquity it was believed that gods punished the impious, e.g. by having them die at sea. See, Nestle, *Legenden* (1936), 259–260 reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 582–584; Wachsmuth, *ΠΟΜΠΙΜΟΣ Ο ΔΑΙΜΩΝ* (1967), 265–271 ('Schiffbruch durch Asebie').

31 Gigon, *Il libro 'Sugli dèi'* (1985), 422–423. Similarly Corradi, *Protagora* (2005), 408. On the fragment of the Epicurean Diogenes of Oenoanda (fr. 16 Smith = T 62), who accuses Protagoras of atheism, see Chilton, *An Epicurean View* (1962), 105–109; Decleva Caizzi, *La tradizione protagorea* (1976), 435–442.

32 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 34 n. 60.

33 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 13 ll. 35–42, 17 ll. 17–19.

34 Suda s.v. Μελανιππίδης 455 (III 350 Adler). Γέγονε as the year of his birth, see p. 44 n. 11 and 12.

35 Jacoby, *loc. cit.* assumed that Diagoras in the Suda s.v. Διαγόρας (T 9 A) is synchronised with Melanippides the Elder. Although some manuscripts transmit the text τοῖς χρόνοις ὧν μετὰ Πίνδαρον καὶ Βακχυλίδην, Μελανιππίδης δε περεσβύτερος, other scholars (incl. Ada Adler [1878–1946], the author of the last critical edition of the Suda) generally accept the variant from codex T: Μελανιππίδου δὲ πρεσβύτερος. From this one may conclude that Diagoras was older than Melanippides the Younger and not younger than Melanippides the Elder. If the variant Μελανιππίδης δὲ πρεσβύτερος is true, the Πίνδαρον καὶ Βακχυλίδην text should be corrected to κατὰ Πίνδαρον καὶ Βακχυλίδην, as was already proposed by Ludolf Küster (1670–1716).

36 Μελῶν ποιητής (*Schol. Arist. Ran. 320* – T 8); ᾀσμάτων ποιητής (Suda s.v. Διαγόρας – T 9 A); διθυραμβοποιός (Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 53 – T 57; *Schol. Arist. Nub.* 830 c – T 6 A; *Schol. Arist. Ran.* 320 – T 8; Suda s.v. Σωκράτης – T 6 B), cf. Suda s.v. Ἴακχος – T 86; παιᾶνα [...] ἐπεποιήκει (Suda s.v. Διαγόρας – T 9 A; Ps.-Hesych. Mil. *De vir. illustr.* 17 – T 9 B); τὸ Μαντινέων ἐνκώμιον (Philod. *PHerc. 1428*, col. XII 1–2 -T 69). The works devoted to Arianthes of Argos and Nicodorus of Mantinea may have been encomia (Philod. *PHerc. 1428*, col. XI 25–34 – fr. 1 and fr. 2). There is no evidence, however, that he wrote epinikia, which is why Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 43 n. 186, doubted

time in the Peloponnese. And it was then that he probably met the boxer Nicodorus of Mantinea, with whom he established a lasting friendship. It is perfectly understandable that Diagoras should soon have tried his luck in the Athens of Pericles, which then led the Delian League as the greatest power in the Hellenic world and at the same time was a vibrant centre of cultural life which drew outstanding figures from other Greek poleis (e.g. Herodotus and Protagoras in the 440s BC). Diagoras may have been in Athens already in the 430s, though no doubt he did not enjoy metic status, as suggested by Ulrich Kahrstedt (1888–1962).[37] His works did not gain popularity, since there is no mention of them in scholia to the comedies of Aristophanes.[38] Instead he received fame for quite a different reason. The whole city knew about his critical attitude towards the Eleusinian Mysteries (see chap. IV 3), and that is why Diagoras started being considered an impious person. It seems to me that Diagoras would have propagated his views orally rather than in writing. He may have done so during symposia or parodied sacred ceremonies in a private house, revealing their mysteries to the uninitiated.[39] A trace of this 'popularity' is found in Aristophanes' comedy the *Clouds* 830 (T 38), performed in 423. In it Socrates is called the Melian (Μήλιος) because he claimed that Zeus did not exist and that the world was ruled by the Vortex (Δῖνος).[40] The scholiasts were right to explain that Aristophanes was implying Socrates was as impious as the known θεομάχος Diagoras.

It seems that Diagoras was no longer in Athens when the *Clouds* was staged. However, it is not possible to establish when he left the city. We only know that in the mid–420s he was in Mantinea. He moved there because the Mantineans had

---

Diagoras actually wrote any. At least it is quite certain he did not write any for the victors of Pan-Hellenic games. See n. 13, above.

37 Kahrstedt, *Studien* (1934), 301 n. 3. This view was rightly rejected by Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 494 n. 1; Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 39 n. 138; Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 276. Recently Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 10 again presumed Diagoras was a métoikos.

38 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 43 n. 186.

39 Compare this with the conduct of Alcibiades (Plut. *Alc.* 22, 4) and Andocides (Ps.-Lys. *Or.* VI 51 οὗτος γὰρ ἐνδὺς στολήν, μιμούμενος τὰ ἱερὰ ἐπεδείκνυ τοῖς ἀμυήτοις καὶ εἶπε τῇ φωνῇ τὰ ἀπόρρητα). See chap. II 3. A different view is held by Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 283 n. 351 'Natürlich kann die Zirkulation von Pamphleten, in denen die Mysterien angegriffen wurden, nicht sicher ausgeschlossen werden'. Yet he does not consider how such 'Pamphleten' could be circulated in Athens and become known to the average Athenian since in the 5th century only a very narrow group actually read books. In fact we know very little about the circulation of literature in the 5th century. We only know that the writings of Anaxagoras could be purchased in Athens (Pl. *Apol.* 26 DE). On the circulation of literature in the Roman world, see Starr, *The Circulation* (1987), 213–223.

40 See chap. II 2 A.

entrusted Nicodorus with the drafting of a democratic constitution after the polis had broken off relations with Sparta in 426. It is generally believed that this took place around 425 (see n. 6). We should remember that Diagoras was in the Peloponnese before his arrival in Athens and that was when he befriended the future lawmaker. Aelian writes in his *Varia historia* II 23 (T 13) that the laws were actually written by Diagoras, as he was a lover (ἐραστής) of Nicodorus. Felix Bölte[41] reckoned Aelian exaggeratedly stressed Diagoras' contribution to the legislation. On the other hand, according to F. Jacoby,[42] the information that Diagoras was the ἐραστής of Nicodorus and drafted laws for the Mantineans was deduced from a poem Diagoras had written in the honour of the legislator (F 2). Aelian had a very high appraisal of the Mantinean constitution, comparing it to the constitutions of the Locrians, Cretans, Lacedaemonians and Athenians. Therefore the Mantinean lawgiver was deemed as great a figure as Zaleucus, Lycurgus and Solon.[43] The Mantinean democracy was also praised by Aristotle (*Polit*. VI 4, 1318 b) and Polybius (VI 43, 1).[44] Aelian was certainly wrong to consider Diagoras to have been the main author of the Mantinean constitution, but we cannot rule out that the Melian to some extent, albeit in a very limited way, did help his friend. Nevertheless, we should not conclude that Diagoras was then considered to be a philosopher and sophist.[45] Aelian adds that he could disclose even more information on Diagoras but would not do so because the Melian was an enemy of the gods (θεοῖς ἐχθρός). It seems that his direct or indirect source could have been Aristoxenus' work Μαντινέων ἔθη.[46] We should add that Diagoras is also mentioned as a lawgiver by John Chrysostom (c. 350–407), alongside Zeno of Citium, Plato, Socrates and Pythagoras.[47]

41 Bölte, *Mantineia* (1930), 1320.

42 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 14 lin. 26–28, 36 n. 79.

43 Ael. *Var. hist*. II 22. Cf. Eustath. *Comment. Hom. Od*. XIX 172 (II 197 Stallbaum).

44 On the history of the constitution, see Fougères, *Mantinée* (1898), 534.

45 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 36 n. 80. It is debatable whether Plutarch (*De superst*. 13, 171 C – T 14), by calling Diagoras νομοθέτης, had in mind legislation in Mantinea. Although Jacoby argues that the word νομοθέτης was used metaphorically, other interpretations of what it really meant are also possible.

46 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 35 n. 76. See chap. II 4. On the concept 'enemy of god' in the ancient Greek and Roman world, see Speyer, *Gottesfeind* (1981), 1004–1022; Veïsse, *L'expression 'ennemi des dieux'* (2009), 169–177.

47 Ioh. Chrysost. *Adv. Iud. or.* 5, 3 (PG 48, 886). καὶ ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀληθές, ἀναλόγισαι πόσοι δόγματα ἠβουλήθησαν εἰσαγαγεῖν παρ' Ἕλλησι καὶ πολιτείαν ἐνστήσασθαι ξένην, οἷον Ζήνων, Πλάτων, Σωκράτης, Διαγόρας, Πυθαγόρας καὶ ἕτεροι μύριοι. Jacoby overlooked this testimonium. See Winiarczyk, *Ergänzungen* (1989), 151.

The ceremony of introducing the democratic constitution was embellished with a work by Diagoras entitled Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον, and to the lawgiver Nicodorus he devoted an encomium εἰς Νικόδωρον τὸν Μαντινέα. The view held by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff that the poem was an epinikion written to honour the victory of the young boxer Nicodorus seems less probable (see n. 13). F. Jacoby proposed a plausible reconstruction of this piece.[48] Diagoras probably referred to the well-known elegy by Xenophanes of Colophon, who claimed that the wisdom of the poet is better than the strength of men and horses and 'athletic victories do not promote or create εὐνομίη in a city'.[49] Diagoras may have mentioned Nicodorus' boxing matches of his youth and showed that his role as a lawgiver brought the city greater benefits than sports victories. Xenophanes' elegy was also a source of inspiration for Euripides in his satyr drama Αὐτόλυκος.[50]

During his stay in Mantinea, Diagoras also wrote a poem that praised Arianthes of Argos (εἰς Ἀριάνθην τὸν Ἀργεῖον). It is understandable why he should devote a poem to an inhabitant of Argos. Mantinea had close relations with that particular polis, especially after 420, when they signed a treaty (together with Athens and Elis) against Sparta. The information about the three above mentioned poems originates from a work by the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara, who relied on a work by Aristoxenus (see chap. II 4).[51] We have no other fragments of Diagoras' poetry.[52]His poetry was probably not known beyond the Peloponnese.[53] F. Jacoby stresses that neither the grammarians nor the lexicographers took any notice of his work, though they did cite the works of fairly mediocre dithyrambic poets, such as Cinesias and Cleomenes.[54] Admittedly, some schol-

48 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 14 ll. 29–40.

49 Xenophan. (DK 21 B 2 = fr. 2 West [II 186–187]) ap. Athen. X 6, 414 AB ῥώμης γὰρ ἀμείνων// ἀνδρῶν ἠδ' ἵππων ἡμετέρη σοφίη (vv. 11–12).

50 Eurip. *Autol.* fr. 282 Kannicht (TrGF V 344–346 = DK 21 C 2) ap. Athen. X 5, 413 EF χρὴ σοφούς τε κἀγαθοὺς//φύλλοις στέφεσθαι, χὥστις ἡγεῖται πόλει//κάλλιστα σώφρων καὶ δίκαιος ὢν ἀνήρ (w. 23–25). On the theme of contrasting the athlete with a soldier, cf. Tyrt. *El.* 12 (II 177–179 West) ap. Stob. IV 10, 1.6 (IV 327–330 Hense). Parallel places are referred to by Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 36 n. 81.

51 Fr. 1 (vv. 1–3) of Diagoras is later referred to by Didymus the Blind of Alexandria (4th century BC) in the work *De trinitate* III 1 (T 70). Grant, *Greek Literature* (1964), 265–269 presumed that the Church Father had taken the citation from a 'monotheistic theosophical anthology'. We should, nevertheless, note that some scholars question the authenticity of this treatise. See Bienert, *'Allegoria' und 'Anagoge'* (1972), 16–20; Hönscheid, *Didymos* (1974), 5–7.

52 On an unsuccessful attempt to acquire another fragment, see chap. IV 5 A, n. 192–193.

53 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 9 ll. 29–30.

54 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 17 ll. 15–17. Herbert Myśliwiec (verbally) stated that he found this argument rather unconvincing, since grammarians and lexicographers were only really interested in rare

ars did propose that his poetry influenced Euripides and Aristophanes, but other scholars have sensibly considered such hypotheses unconvincing.[55] This is probably evidence that Diagoras was a second-rate poet, of whom no one would have heard if in antiquity he had not been considered a notorious atheist.

Diagoras remained in Mantinea until 418, that is up until the anti-Spartan coalition forces were defeated at Mantinea. It is understandable why a friend of Nicodorus would then have to leave the city and seek the shelter of another polis. He most probably headed for Athens.[56]

In the spring of 416, the Athenian fleet set sail for the island of Melos in the western Cyclades to persuade its inhabitants to join the Athenian-led Delian League. The Peloponnesian War had been underway for some years now, and Melos remained neutral.[57] As in 426, now they also refused to join the Delian

---

words and grammatical constructions. If Diagoras' poetry had no linguistic peculiarities, there would have been no reason to mention him as an author.

55 1) Eurip. *Bellerophontes* fr. 286, 15 Kannicht (= Imitatio 1 Winiarczyk): an allusion to Diagoras' book Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was seen by Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (1884), 473 n. 24; Nestle, *Euripides* (1901), 415 n. 2, 447 n. 103; *idem*, *Kritias* (1903), 98 n. 4; *idem*, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 417 n. 81; Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016), 113. It was already rejected by Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 133.

2) Arist. *Nub.* 1024–1025 (Imitatio 2 W.): an allusion to Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was seen by Nestle, *Legenden* (1936), 259 n. 7, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 584 n. 52, but doubted by Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 32 n. 5.

3) Arist. *Aves* 544–545 (Imitatio 3 W.): Münchenberg, *De Diagora* (1877), 22 n. 2 and Bergk, *Poetae lirici* (1882), 563, believed the phrase, κατὰ δαίμονα καί <τινα> συντυχίαν ἀγαθήν immitated κατὰ δαίμονα καὶ τύχαν in Diagoras fr. 2, but Kock, Schroeder, *Die Vögel* (1927), 70, considered this phrase 'gewiß altgeheiligte Formel'. Similarly Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 9 ll. 27–29. Nor is any allusion seen here by Page, *Poetae Melici* (1962), 382.

4) The term θεὸς, θεός (fr. 1) is a stereotypical phrasing, which often appears in the works of various poets: Bacch. 3, 21; Pind. *Pyth.* 2, 49–50; Eur. *Andr.* 1031 and *Herc.* 772. See. Hesych. *Lex.* s.v. θεός (II 313 Latte) [Falsa T 99 W.] θεὸς, θεός· ἔθος ἦν, ὅτε κατάρχοιντό τινος, λέγειν θεὸν ἐπιφημιζομένοις. Cf. Eustath. *Comment. ad Hom. Iliad.* II 478 (I 394 van der Valk) [Falsa T 100 W.]. That is why Lana is wrong to include the testimonia of Hesychius of Alexandria and Eustathius in the Diagoras edition (T 32 and 32[1]). See Blass, *Nachlese zu Bacchylides* (1901), 272–273; Page, *Poetae Melici* (1962), 382 'Diagoram non respiciunt'; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 407 'Vom rituellen Ruf stammt vermutlich die Verdoppelung des Worts, theós ! theós !; dies bezeichnet die Epiphanie'.

56 The assumption of Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 63, that Diagoras left Athens several times in the years 425–418 seems quite unfounded. Diagoras certainly did not have to be in Athens during the performance of Aristophanes' *Clouds* in 423, since the Athenians would have probably remembered well his earlier critical attitude towards the Eleusinian Mysteries.

57 E.g., see Treu, *Athen und Melos* (1953/54), 253–273; *idem*, *Nachtrag* (1954/55), 58–59 (Melos paid a contribution); Eberhardt, *Der Melierdialog* (1959), 284–314 (Athens arbitrarily included Melos on the list of states paying contributions); Raubitschek, *War Melos tributpflichtig?* (1963),

League.[58] In his famous 'Melian dialogue' Thucydides presents the arguments put forward by both poleis.[59] In summer of 416, the Athenians began their siege by surrounding the city with a wall (see chap. II 2 B). Once the food supplies ran out, the Melians began to starve and thus eventually in the winter of 416/415 were forced to surrender.[60] The Athenian troops slaughtered all the men and took the women and children into slavery. 500 Athenian colonists were next sent to Melos (Thuc. V 116, 4). The actions of the Athenians were condemned throughout Greece and in the 4th century BC Athenian rule was associated with the capture of Melos (Xen. *Hellen*. II 2, 3). Isocrates' attempts to justify Athens in writing were of little consequence.[61] The expression 'Melian hunger' became proverbial and was still repeated in the Byzantine Empire.[62] I have briefly presented the Athenian treatment of Melos as this was the native city of Diagoras. Some scholars have doubted that the Melian Diagoras could safely exist in Athens during the siege,[63] especially at a time when the Athenians were so brutal towards the inhabitants of Melos.[64] We should, however, remember that the cruel treatment of Melians

78–82; Buchner, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien und die Frage der Tributpflicht* (1974), 91–99 (recognizes the credibility of Thucydides' account); Bauslaugh, *The Concept of Neutrality* (1991), 142–146. See n. 59.

58 Seaman, *The Athenian Expedition* (1997), 385–418. On Nicias' expedition against Melos in 426, see Geske, *Nikias* (2005), 45–53.

59 Thuc. V 84–116. Literature on the Melian dialogue in the years 1900–1970 was listed by West, *A Bibliography* (1970), 158–160. Also see Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *A Historical Commentary* (1970), IV, 155–192; Macleod, *Form and Meaning* (1974), 385–400, reprint in: *idem*, *Collected Essays* (1983), 52–67; Cagnazzi, *La spedizione* (1983), 85–90 ('Storia degli studi'); Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 305–312; Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 633–639; Bosworth, *The Humanitarian Aspect* (1993), 30–44, reprint in: Rusten (ed.), *Thucydides* (2009), 312–336; Morrison, *Historical Lessons* (2000), 119–148, reprint in: *idem*, *Reading Thucydides* (2006), 222–232; Will, *Der Untergang von Melos* (2006), 95–119; Hornblower, *A Commentary* (2008), III, 218–225. See n. 57.

60 Luschnat, *Thukidydes* (1970), 1133–1136 argues that the historian understood winter to mean from the start of November to early March, when navigation was limited to a minimum.

61 Isocrat. *Paneg*. 100–102. 110; *Panath*. 63. 89. See Cagnazzi, *La spedizione* (1983), 73–78.

62 See Hesych. s.v. λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (II 599 Latte); Photius, *Lex*. s.v. λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (II 508 Theodoridis); Suda, s.v. λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (III 272 Adler); Zenobius IV 94 (CPG I 113). Cf. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 186.

63 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 39 n. 138; Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 182–183. Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 494 n. 1, considers it impossible for Diagoras to have arrived in Athens after the capture of Melos. Yet he does not take into account that Diagoras had probably been living in Athens since 418. Many scholars support the view that Diagoras was in Athens after the capture of Melos (see the list of scholars in: Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* [2000], 170 n. 47) and that he was charged with impiety in 415/414.

64 It is worth adding that this was not the first example of brutal treatment of other poleis. The Athenians drove out all the inhabitants of Histiaia on the island of Euboea (Thuc. I 114, 3) as well

was not a spontaneous action of the Athenian soldiers enraged by the inhabitants' sustained resistance, nor did it result from any particular Athenian hatred of Melos. The Athenian soldiers were merely carrying out a resolution of the People's Assembly, which had probably been inspired by Alcibiades (Ps.-Andoc. *Or.* 4, 22; Plut. *Alcib.* 16, 6). This resolution called for such drastic measures to discourage other island poleis in the Aegean from taking up a neutral stance in the Peloponnesian War and withdrawing from the Delian League.[65]

The Athenians therefore punished Melos as an example for political purposes, but they had no reason to persecute a lyric poet from that island who had probably been in Athens since 418. Moreover, it was known that Diagoras had travelled in Hellas for many years, taking commissions to write various works, and had already been in Athens a dozen or so years earlier. Therefore the view held by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff that Diagoras remained a Melian only in name and practically had nothing to do with the island seems correct.[66] Moreover, it seems probable that Diagoras did not openly express his critical attitude towards the Eleusinian Mysteries during the siege of Melos. On the other hand, Bernhard Smarczyk's view that Diagoras continued to criticise the Eleusinian Mysteries after the brutal treatment of Melians by the Athenian soldiers does not seem likely (see chap. IV 3).

In 415/414 Diagoras started facing a great danger. Just before the Athenian fleet set sail for Sicily, Herms were mutilated[67] and rumours spread about Alcibi-

---

as the inhabitants of Aegina (Tuc. II 27, 1). On the Chalcidice peninsula they sold all the women and children of the city of Torone as slaves (Thuc. V 3, 4), whereas in Scione they not only made all the women and children slaves, but also murdered all the men (Thuc. V 32, 1). See Xen. *Hellen.* II 2, 3 (mentions Athenians' brutal treatment of the inhabitants of Melos, Histiaia, Scione, Torone and Aegina) and Cagnazzi, *La spedizione* (1983), 67–72. Cf. n. 61.

65 On the history of Melos in the 5th century, see Zschietzschmann, *Melos* (1931), 582–583; Deininger, *Der Melierdialog* (1939), 1–4; Will, *Der Untergang Melos* (2006), 25–30.

66 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 83.

67 E.g., see Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade* (1951), 158–195; Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *A Historical Commentary* (1970), IV, 264–290; Osborne, *The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai* (1985), 47–73; Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 322–333, 537–550; Furley, *Andokides and the Herms* (1996), 13–30; McGlew, *Politics on the Margins* (1999), 17–21; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 192–220; Todd, *Revisiting the Herms and the Mysteries* (2004), 92–97; Hornblower, *A Commentary* (2008), 367–381; Lévy, *Les Hermocopides* (2013), 235–237; Rubel, *Fear* (2014), 80–92, 218–226. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 125–129. On the gradual evolution of the Herms and their role in the lives of the Athenians, see for example: Zanker, *Wandel der Hermesgestalt* (1965), 91–103; Wrede, *Die antike Herme* (1985); *idem*, *Herme* (1988) 706–713; Siébert, *Hermes* (1990), 295–306, 374–378; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 80–83; Rückert, *Die Herme* (1998); Quinn, *Herms* (2007), 82–105.

ades parodying the Eleusinian Mysteries.[68] Widespread outrage at such sacrilegious acts, coupled with obsessive fear of an oligarchic coup or the establishment of a tyranny (see chap. II 2 B), resulted in a frantic search for the hermokopids and also those responsible for the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[69] As a consequence of this witch-hunt, many innocent people became victims (Thuc. VI 27–28, 60). Diagoras now could not avoid the charge of impiety. People would have certainly remembered how he had openly criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries and discouraged people from taking part in their initiation rites. Although Diagoras did not belong to Alcibiades' circle and was not involved in the mutilation of the Herms, he knew perfectly well that only his flight from Athens could save him from death. That is why he escaped to Pellene,[70] a polis in the Achaea region of

68 Lewis, *After the Profanation of the Mysteries* (1966), 177–191, reprint in: *idem*, *Selected Papers* (1997), 158–172; Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *loc. cit.*; Ostwald, *loc. cit.*; Murray, *The Affair of the Mysteries* (1990), 149–161 (the Mysteries were not parodied, they were performed correctly, though in a private house. See critical comments regarding this hypothesis, in: Bremmer, *Religious Secrets* [1995], 77); Furley, *Andokides and the Herms* (1996), 31–40; McGlew, *Politics on the Margins* (1999), 5–11; Graf, *Der Mysterienprozeß* (2000), 114–127, 270–273; Rubel, *Der Stadt in Angst* (2000), 220–232; Todd, *Revisiting* (2004), 89–92; Hornblower, *loc. cit.*; Rubel, *Fear* (2014), 92–97, 226–228. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *loc. cit.*

69 See Craterus (FGrHist 342 F 16) ap. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073 (T 7 A) ἐπεὶ τὰ μυστήρια πᾶσι διηγεῖτο κοινοποιῶν αὐτὰ καὶ μικρὰ ποιῶν καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους μυεῖσθαι ἀποτρέπων. *Schol. Arist. Nub.* 830c (T 6 A) ὃς τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι μυστήρια ἐξορχησάμενος καὶ ἐξειπὼν ἀσεβέστατος ἐκρίθη. In my opinion, one cannot convincingly justify the hypothesis of Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 282 n. 347, that ' "die Lehren" des Diagoras wohl auch als geistige Grundlagen der Mysterien-Profanierungen in verschiedenen Privathäusern angesehen [wurden]'. There are also no grounds to support the hypothesis of Marasco, *I processi* (1976), 124 n. 63, that the trial was brought about by Eleusinian priests. See chap. IV 6, n. 251.

70 *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073 (T 7 A) write of the inhabitants of Pellene (Πελλανεῖς), who refused to hand over Diagoras; Al Mubaššir (T 10) writes that Diagoras escaped to the city of Bālīn (i.e. Pellene) in Achaea. Some scholars (including, Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 68; Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 191 n. 37; Katz, *The Birds* (1976), 371 n. 58; Romer, *Atheism* (1994), 356; Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 9 n. 31; *idem*, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 11) see an allusion to Diagoras' escape in the words of Peisetairos addressed to sycophant in Aristoph. *Aves* 1421 (T 84) μῶν εὐθὺ Πελλήνης πέτεσθαι διανοεῖ ; This is doubtful, however, since Aristophanes' scholiasts say that here there is an allusion to famous woollen cloaks (χλαῖναι Πελληνικαί) which were made in Pellene. They were used as prizes for victors in the *Hermaia*. Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 9, 97–98; *Nem.* 10, 44; Suda s.v. Πελληναῖος χιτών (IV 81 Adler). See Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 183 n. 2; Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 42 n. 180; Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 281 n. 344; Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 677–678; Degani, *Aristophane et les manteaux de Pellène* (1997), 110–112. Quite implausible is the information found in *Gnom. Basil.* 157 Kindstrand = *Cod. Leid. Vossianus* 68 (T 25), stating that Diagoras was imprisoned and then executed Ὁ αὐτὸς (scil. Διαγόρας) ληφθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων καὶ μέλλων ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ θάνατον ἄγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ θεοὺς μὴ ὀνομάζειν, ἀνατείνας τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔφη· ὦ θεοί, εἰ ἐστὲ θεοί, σώσατέ με.

the Peloponnese, which from the very start of the Peloponnesian War had sided with Sparta and was its faithful ally.[71]

Diagoras was charged with impiety *in absentia* (ἐρήμῃ δίκῃ), as was Alcibiades.[72] The εἰσαγγελία procedure[73] was most probably used, because γραφὴ ἀσεβείας does not appear to have been introduced until after changes in the legal code at the end of the 5th century BC (410–404, 403–399)[74] The Athenians must have demanded from Pellene the extradition of Diagoras,[75] and when this was refused, the People's Assembly passed a decree offering one talent for Diagoras' murder and two talents for capturing him alive[76] L. Woodbury assumed

71 See Thuc. II 9, 2 (Pellene sided with Sparta in 431); V 58, 4 (Pellene as the only Achaean city took part in the expedition of king Agis against Argos in 418); VIII 3, 2 (Pellene provided ships for the Peloponnesian fleet in 413); Xen. *Hellen*. IV 2, 20 (Pellene was an ally of Sparta during the Corinthian war).

72 See Thuc. VI 61, 7 οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι ἐρήμῃ δίκῃ θάνατον κατέγνωσαν αὐτοῦ (scil. Ἀλκιβιάδου) τε καὶ τῶν μετ' ἐκείνου. On the γραφὴ ἀσεβείας procedure, see Lipsius, *Das attische Recht* (1908), 358–368; Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 217–245; Reverdin, *La religion* (1945), 208–217 ('La législation attique contre l'impiété'); Rudhardt, *La définition du délit d'impiété* (1960), 87–105; MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (1978), 197–200 ('Impiety'), 200–202 ('Atheism'); Cohen, *The Prosecution of Impiety* (1988) 695–701, reprint in: *idem*, *Law, Sexuality, and Society* (1991) 203–217; Versnel, *Inconsistencies* (1990), 123–131; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 85–90.

73 Thus, e.g. Reverdin, *La religion* (1945), 213; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 163 n. 6, 182; MacDowell, *Law* (1978), 46–47, 201; Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 536; Auffarth, *Aufnahme* (1995), 341. On the εἰσαγγελία procedure, see: Bonner, Smith, *The Administration of Justice* (1930), I, 294–309; Harrisson, *The Law* (1971), II, 50–59; Hansen, *Eisangelia* (1975), esp. 12–28.

74 When in 411 the Four Hundred government fell, a group of νομοθέται were appointed to draft a new body of laws (Thuc. VIII 97, 2; Andoc. *De myst*. 83). Work on the new legal code was interrupted by the rule of the Thirty Tyrants (Sept 404 – May 403) and resumed after the decree of Teisamenus (cf. Canevaro, Harris, *The Documents* [2012], 110–116]). On activities of Nicomachus, who became τῶν νόμων ἀναγραφεύς, see Lys. *Or*. 30, 2–4. Also see MacDowell, *Andocides*, *On the Mysteries* (1962), 121–125, 194–199; Clinton, *The Nature* (1982), 27–37; Robertson, *The Law of Athens* (1990), 43–75; Rhodes, *The Athenian Code* (1991), 87–100; *Todd, Lysias against Nikomachos* (1996), 101–131; Carawan, *The Athenian Amnesty* (2013), 233–250 ('The Case against Nikomachos and Rewriting the Laws').

75 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 12 ll. 8–27 assumed that traces of these diplomatic negotiations could be found in the rather unclear passage ἔπειθον δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Πελοποννησίους (Craterus, FGrHist 342 F 16 ap. *Schol. Aristoph. Ran*. 320 = T 8). Similarly Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 191.

76 The testimonia are cited in chap. II 2B, n. 35 cf. Thuc. VI 60, 4. An interesting parallel is given by Swoboda, *Beiträge* (1905), 174 n. 2. According to Athenaeus (VI 90, 266 CD), the authorities of the city of Chios issued a decree offering a large sum of money for the capture or murder of Drimacus, the leader of Chios slaves (ἐκήρυξε γὰρ ἡ πόλις χρήματα δώσειν πολλὰ τῷ αὐτὸν λάβοντι ἢ τὴν κηφαλὴν κομίσαντι). See OGIS I 218 (a talent od silver would be given to the one who kills a tyrant or the leader of the oligarchs).

that the Athenians wanted Diagoras captured alive because they expected he could provide information on those who had participated in the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[77] This hypothesis is contradicted by the fact that Aristophanes mentions Diagoras in his 414 comedy the *Birds* (see chap. II 2 B), even though Syracusius' decree forbade comedy writers to mention persons charged with the mutilation of the Herms or profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[78] Moreover, Diagoras was not on the list of those charged with the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[79] The Athenians also imposed sanctions against Pellene. The assumption that its citizens were excluded from participation in the Eleusinian Mysteries seems probable.[80] This decree, which most probably applied to all Delian League poleis, was inscribed on a bronze stele.[81] It was displayed in the Acropolis,[82] and a copy was probably also installed in Eleu-

---

Some scholars have rejected the two-stage proceedings against Diagoras: MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (1978), 201; Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 276; Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 10; *idem*, *God*, *Science* (2002/2003), 13. They assume that the decree was immediately passed by the People's Assembly.

77 Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 181–182. Similarly Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 283 n. 349. Differently Usteri, *Ächtung und Verbannung* (1903), 43 'die Einlieferung des lebendigen Diagoras war nur deshalb erwünschter, weil durch die offizielle Hinrichtung die Gesamtheit als solche ihre Rache besser befriedigen konnte.' Likewise Swoboda, *Beiträge* (1905), 174.

78 See Sommerstein, *The Decree of Syrakosios* (1986), 101–108. According to Kyriakidi, *Aristophanes und Eupolis* (2007), 22–24, the reason for this decree was the staging of the Βάπται comedy, which attacked Alcibiades 'kurz vor den Ereignissen 415'. Also Storey, *Eupolis* (2003), 108–110, assumes the Βάπται were staged during the *Lenaia* of 415. I think it is wrong to question the historicity of this decree and assume that it was merely an erroneous interpretation of Hellenistic scholiasts. Such views have been expressed by Halliwell, *Ancient Interpretations* (1984), 87; *idem*, *Comic Satire* (1991), 56–58; Csapo, Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (1995), 416. The historicity of the decree was defended by Henderson, *The Dēmos and Comic Competition* (1990), 289 and Atkinson, *Curbing the Comedians* (1992), 61–64.

79 The lists of people charged with the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries are found in: Gomme, Andrewes, Dover, *A Historical Commentary* (1970), IV, 277–280; Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 537–550.

80 Thus Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 82 and Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 34 n. 47; Smarczyk, *op. cit.*, 280. 281 n. 344; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 172.

81 Melanthius (FGrHist 342 F 3) ap. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073b (T 7 A) Μελάνθιος δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ μυστηρίων προφέρεται τῆς χαλκῆς στήλης ἀντίγραφον, ἐν ᾗ ἐξεκήρυξαν καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς <μὴ> ἐκδιδόντας Πελλανεῖς. On bronze steles, see Stroud, *A Fragment of an Inscribed Bronze Stele from Athens* (1963), 138 n. 1; Rosenmeyer, *Notes on Aristophanes' "Birds"* (1972), 236 n. 1. See Pollux X 97 (Greek text in chap. II 2 B, n. 36). Probably only Usteri, *Ächtung* (1903), 43 with n. 1 presumed the decree only concerned Attica.

82 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.*, 81–82.

sis.[83] The text of the decree was passed on by the Attidographer Melanthius in his work Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι μυστηρίων and Craterus in his Συναγωγὴ τῶν ψηφισμάτων.[84]

We do not know the later fate of Diagoras after his escape to Pellene. Although the *Suda* (s.v. Diagoras = T 9 A) states that Diagoras died in Corinth, it probably confused him with Diagoras of Eretria.[85] F. Jacoby admitted he was unable to disprove this view since the *Suda* does, indeed, often include two different people of the same name in a single entry.[86] He, nevertheless, added that it is not entirely improbable that two different people called Diagoras died in Corinth at two different times.[87] The Diagoras mentioned by Aristotle (*Polit*. V 6 p. 1306 a 35–36) was most probably not our Diagoras but the politician Diagoras of Eretria.[88]

It seems that the legend of Diagoras dying in a shipwreck at sea emerged in ancient times (Athen. XIII 92 p. 611 AB – T 22 A).[89] It was based on the widespread belief that the gods punished atheists.[90] In the case of Diagoras such a punishment would be very fitting, since he did not believe that the gods saved people from dangers lurking at sea and ridiculed votive offerings submitted to the Cabeiri at Samothrace.[91]

For the sake of clarity I sum up the key facts of Diagoras' life in the following points:

---

83 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 11 ll. 35–36. Cf. Pollux X 97 and Pippin, *The Demioprata of Pollux X* (1956), 318–328.

84 Melanthius (FGrHist 326 F 3) ap. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073 (T 7 A). Craterus (FGrHist 342 F 16) ap. *Schol. Arist. Aves* 1073 (T 7 A). See chap. II 2 B, n. 37 and 38.

85 Thus, e.g., Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 82 n. 2; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 495 n. 6. Cf. Heraclides Lembus fr. 40 Dilts (T 90).

86 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 13 l. 43 – 14 l. 2.

87 Thus Meier, *Diagoras* (1833), 444; Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 418.

88 Thus, e.g., Schneidewin, *Heraclidis Politiarum quae extant* (1847), 82; C. Müller, *FHG* II, 1848, 217 (ad Heracl. fr. 12); Münchenberg, *De Diagora* (1877), 19–20; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *loc. cit*. Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 173–174, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 74–75, nevertheless, associated the Diagoras mentioned by Aristotle with Diagoras of Melos. On the politician Diagoras of Eretria, see Geyer, *Topographie* (1903), 66–67.

89 See Winiarczyk, *Ad Athen. Dipnosoph. XIII 92 p. 611 A-B* (1974), 164–166. There I tried to show that manuscript text should not be corrected. That is why I rejected U. von Wilamowitz Möllendorff's conjecture which he gave in Georg Kaibel's edition of Athenaeus (vol. III, Lipsiae, 1890). My argumentation was accepted by Gambato, *Ateneo, I Deipnosofisti* (2001), 1575 n. 6.

90 See Nestle, *Legenden vom Tod der Gottesverächter* (1936), 259–260, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 582–584; Wachsmuth, *ΠΟΜΠΙΜΟΣ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ* (1967), 265–271 ('Schiffbruch durch Asebie').

91 Cic. *Nat. deor*. III 89 (T 36); Diog. Laert. VI 59 (T 37). See chap II 2 B, n. 35.

1. Diagoras, the son of Teleclytus or Telecleides, was born on the island of Melos in the first half of the 5th century BC.
2. He became an itinerant poet, receiving commissions to write dithyrambs, encomia, paeans and perhaps also epinikia (among other places, he stayed in the Peloponnese and befriended the boxer Nicodorus of Mantinea).
3. He probably arrived in Athens in the 430s BC.
4. Criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries earned Diagoras notoriety as an atheist (an allusion to his atheistic views was made in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, performed in 423).
5. Around 425–418 he stayed in Mantinea, at a time when Nicodorus drafted a democratic constitution. Diagoras wrote Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον for the ceremony of enacting this constitution.
6. After the defeat of the anti-Spartan coalition in the battle of Mantinea, 418, Diagoras left the city and most probably moved to Athens.
7. He remained in Athens in the years 418–415/414.
8. In 415/414, in danger of being tried for impiety, Diagoras fled from Athens to Pellene. When the citizens of Pellene refused to have Diagoras extradited, the Athenians offered a reward of one silver talent for the killing of Diagoras, and two talents for his capture.
9. Diagoras remained in Pellene.
10. The place of his death is unknown, but it probably occurred before the end of the 5th century BC.

IV. The Problem of Diagoras' Atheism

1. Methodological issues

In ancient sources we frequently find information about atheists and atheism.[1] That is why many modern scholars believed that atheism was already present in antiquity.[2] It was tacitly assumed that in ancient times the word atheist (ἄθεος) meant someone who completely denied the existence of gods. For a long time no one reflected on the actual significance of ancient testimonies and how the ancients understood the concept of atheism. It is hard to resist the impression that the understanding of ancient atheism was often determined, no doubt often quite unconsciously, by the given scholar's personal philosophical and religious views. Moreover, speaking of atheism in antiquity always has ideological implications and is sometimes used, albeit in a very discreet way, for other than purely scientific purposes. That is why some maintain that there were many atheists in antiquity, while others maintain there was no atheism in those times. Sometimes the same person is presented as a radical atheist in one book and strongly defended against this accusation in another.

A. First of all we should remember that in antiquity the word ἄθεος had various meanings.[3] In the works of 5th-century BC lyric poets and tragedians the word did not mean a person who denied the very existence of deities, but rather someone who was *godless*, *immoral, heinous*[4] or, more rarely, *abandoned by the*

1 See Winiarczyk, *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?* (1984), 157–183 and (1992), 306–310; *idem*, *Antike Bezeichnungen der Gottlosigkeit und des Atheismus* (1992), 216–225. See Appendix I. On ancient atheism see, e.g., Drachmann, *Atheism* (1922); Nestle, *Atheismus* (1950), 866–870; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969); Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 216–232 ('Atheism'); Dihle, *Philosophie und Tradition* (1986), 13–24; Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1989), 451–461; Winiarczyk, *Methodisches zum antiken Atheismus* (1990), 1–15; Dihle, *Aufklärung in der Antike?* (1992), 12–32; Giannantoni, *L'ateismo* (1992), 208–228; Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie zum antiken Atheismus* (1994); Löhr, *Religionskritik* (1998), 1–21; Schröder, *Ursprünge des Atheismus* (1998), 21–57; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 82–90; Cancik-Lindemaier, *Gottlosigkeit im Altertum* (2006), 15–31; Bremmer, *Atheism in Antiquity* (2007), 11–26; Mikalson, *Greek Popular Religion* (2010), 229–241; Sedley, *The Atheist Underground* (2013), 329–348; Rubel, *Fear* (2014), 31–35, 192–193; Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016); Winiarczyk, *Religionskritik* (2016).

2 On the state of research into ancient atheism in the first half of the 18th century, see Reimmann, *Historia universalis atheismi* (1725), 109–305; Ludovoci, *Atheisterey* (1751), 618–628.

3 See Stauffer, *ἄθεος* (1938), 120–122; Fahr, *op. cit*., 15–17, 193–194; Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1968), 44–45; Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes* (1975), 15–16. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 131–133.

4 Aesch. *Pers*. 808; *Eum*. 151. 541; Soph. *Trach*. 1036; *Oed*. *Rex* 1360; *El*. 124. 1181.

gods.[5] The word ἄθεος in the sense someone 'who denies the existence of gods' first appeared in Plato's *Apology* (26 C) [see chap. IV 2]. Later writers of the same period used the word ἄθεος in various contexts and therefore in each case its meaning needs to be individually determined.[6] It is worth adding that Jews and Christians also used the term *atheist* against pagans. The latter also used it in reference to heretics of their own religion.[7] We should also remember that the concept of impiety (ἀσέβεια) was broader than that of ἀθεότης. Ernst Sandvoss (1929–2013) rightly noted that every ἄθεος was impious (ἀσεβής), whereas not every impious person was ἄθεος.[8] Also pertinent is F. Jacoby's comment that 'ἀσεβεῖν εἰς τοὺς θεούς is not the same as μὴ νομίζειν εἶναι θεούς'.[9]

B. One has to admit that the definition of atheism (i.e. theoretical atheism) poses many problems for scholars.[10] Historians of philosophy and religion, theologians and psychologists distinguish many types of atheism and propose various definitions. Karl Rahner (1904–1984) rightly noted that the answer to what is atheism depends on what concept of deity one accepts.[11] Definitions of atheism that include agnosticism, epistemological scepticism or even pan-

5 Soph. *Oed. Rex* 661. Cf. Fahr, *op.cit*., 17 'Es ist festzuhalten … daß dieses Wort (scil. ἄθεος) in seinen ersten Belegen noch nicht als Attribut zu Personen, sondern als Attribut zu einer Sache (βέλη bei Pindar [Pyth. 4, 162]) und einem Vorgang (μανίαι bei Bakchylides [Epin. 11, 109]) verwendet ist.'

6 Various definitions of the ἄθεος concept in: Winiarczyk, *Antike Bezeichnungen* (1992), 216–225.

7 See, e.g., Harnack, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus* (1905), 3–16; Simpson, *Epicureans, Christians, Atheists* (1941), 372–381; Fascher, *Der Vorwurf der Gottlosigkeit* (1963), 78–105; Brox, *Zum Vorwurf des Atheismus* (1966), 274–282; Speigl, *Der römische Staat* (1970), 144–152; Savon, *L'athéisme jugé par les chrétiens* (1986), 11–24; Walsh, *On Christian Atheism* (1991), 255–277; Beatrice, *L'accusation d'athéisme* (2004), 133–152.

8 Sandvoss, *Asebie und Atheismus* (1968), 314 'jeder ἄθεος ist ἀσεβής, nicht jeder ἀσεβής dagegen ἄθεος'. Cf. Ps.-Aristot. *De virt. et vit*. 1251 a 31 ἀσέβεια μὲν ἡ περὶ θεοὺς πλημμέλεια καὶ περὶ δαίμονας ἢ καὶ περὶ τοὺς κατοιχομένους καὶ περὶ γονεῖς καὶ περὶ πατρίδα. Polyb. XXXVI 9, 15 ἀσέβημα εἶναι τὸ εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς καὶ τοὺς τεθνεῶτας ἁμαρτάνειν. On impiety, see Bolkestein, Ὅσιος en εὐσεβής (1936), 200–210 ('εὐσεβής et ἀσεβής'); Foerster, ἀσεβής, ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβέω (1964), 184–190 (s.v. σέβομαι); Lampe, *op. cit*., 242–243; Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales* (1992), 12–14 (ἀσέβεια – εὐσέβεια); Delli Pizzi, *Impiety* (2011), 59–76; Phillips, *The Law of Ancient Athens* (2013), 407–462 ('Impiety'). Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 131–133.

9 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 45 n. 222.

10 See, e.g., Girardi, *Pour une définition de l'athéisme* (1963), 47–74; *idem*, *'Ateismo': precisazioni terminologiche* (1967), 8–31; Edwards, *Definition of 'Atheism'* (1967), 175–177; Barth, *Atheismus – Geschichte und Begriff* (1973), 64–79; Wucherer-Huldenfeld, *Phänomen und Bedeutung des gegenwärtigen Atheismus* (1979), esp. 36–40 ('Terminologische Vorüberlegungen'); Bullivant, *Defining Atheism* (2013), 11–21.

11 Rahner, *Atheismus* (1968), 372 'Die Beantwortung der Frage, wo genau Atheismus vorliegt, hängt davon ab, welchen genauen Gottesbegriff man voraussetzt.' Similarly Rolfes, *Atheismus/Theismus* (2005), 100 'Was dann als Atheismus bezeichnet wird, hängt von der vorausgesetzten Gottesvorstellung ab.'

theism or deism seem too broad. It is also wrong to equate materialism with atheism or call Ionian philosophers of nature atheists.[12] However, the definition proposed by Gustav Mensching (1901–1978) seems correct. He regarded atheism as being unaware of or negating the existence of numinous beings.[13] Therefore I accept the following definition of atheism as: 'the negation of the existence of any type of deity or supernatural forces.'

C. In antiquity the most famous atheists were Diagoras of Melos and the philosopher Theodorus of Cyrene (4th/3rd century).[14] They appear in most catalogues of atheists, and there the word ἄθεος often appears next to their names. They were also considered the authors of atheistic books and charged with impiety. Scholars who wished to prove that Diagoras and Theodorus were radical atheists willingly referred to the doxographic tradition which passed on to us the catalogues of atheists.[15] Although such testimonies are relatively numerous, most of them were written in the Roman Empire period, i.e. several hundred years later. The earliest testimony is found in Cicero's treatise *De natura deorum*, which was written in the 40s BC.[16] Therefore, it is clear that later authors (chiefly doxographers and Church Fathers) drew their information from secondary sources and, no doubt, repeated it uncritically. It seems that the centuries which separated them from the times of Diagoras and Theodorus denied these authors the possibility of verifying their sources. I once tried to show a large proportion of catalogues of atheists were derived from the *index atheorum*, compiled by Clitomachus of Carthage, a scholarch of the Platonic Academy in the years 127/126–110/109.[17] Therefore,

12 Thus Cogniot, *Le matérialisme gréco-romain* (1964), 24–25, 78–79; Ley, *Geschichte der Aufklärung und des Atheismus* (1966), 39, 179–180. The views of these Marxist scholars were rightly criticised by Fahr, *op. cit*., 171; Babut, *La religion des philosophes grecs* (1974), 8; Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 227.

13 Mensching, *Atheismus (religionsgeschichtlich)* (1957), 670 'Der Begriff des Atheismus bedeutet streng genommen entweder die Unkenntnis numinoser Wesenheiten oder deren Leugnung.' He referred to the term *numinosum*, which was introduced by Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) in his book *Das Heilige* (1917).

14 See von Fritz, *Theodoros* (1934), 1825–1831; Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 64–94; *idem*, *Theodoros und Diogenes* (1981), 37–42; Brancacci, *Teodoro* (1982), 55–85; Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 189–193; Zilioli, *The Cyrenaics* (2012), 181–184; Lampe, *The Birth of Hedonism* (2015), 23–25, 110–115, 147–167. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 86–88.

15 See Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976) 32–46; *idem*, *Starożytne wykazy ateistów* (1977) 3–92; Runia, *Atheists in Aëtius* (1996) 542–576, reprint in: Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana III* (2010) 343–373. On the doxographic tradition, see chap. II 8 C, n. 174.

16 Cic. *Nat. deor*. I 2 (T 40); I 117 (T 42).

17 See n. 15. Some scholars suppose that Clitomachus wrote a book entitled Περὶ ἀθεότητος - e.g. Nestle, *Vom Mythos* (1942), 416; *idem*, *Atheismus* (1950), 869; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 176; Guthrie,

those who think they can prove the radical atheism of Diagoras and Theodorus on the basis of testimonies from the Roman Empire period or the somewhat earlier times of Cicero are making a serious methodological mistake.[18]

Clement of Alexandria (+ c. 212 r.) is the only Christian author to refer to *index atheorum* and at the same time defend Diagoras and Theodorus against the accusation of atheism. What is more, he actually praised the pagan ἄθεοι. Nevertheless, we should not jump to any conclusions with regard to this particular testimony. Instead we should first try to understand how this Church Father approached the problem of atheism. Clement considered those who worshipped pagan gods to be atheists, because such gods did not exist, and for this reason they were unable to see the real existence of God (*Protr*. II 23, 1). To support his argumentation he cited a letter from Paul the Apostle, which states that pagans lived as 'strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God (ἄθεοι) in the world.'[19] Clement was not alone in this approach to pagan religion.[20] Origen (+ 254) used the paradoxical terms 'polytheistic atheism' (ἡ πολύθεος ἀθεότης)[21] and 'atheistic polytheism' (ἡ ἄθεος πολυθεότης),[22] in reference to pagan religion. Therefore, Clement wondered why people who denied the existence of pagan gods and were more critical of the theological erring of others should be called atheists (*Protr*. II 24, 2). This is why it is obviously pointless to refer to Clement's testimony when discussing the atheism of Diagoras and Theodorus. The situation would indeed be similar if someone tried to prove the atheism of Euhemerus on the basis of the testimonies of Theophilus of Antioch (+ c. 180 AD) or Plutarch of Chaeronea (before 50 – after 120). The Church Father called Euhemerus ἀθεώτατος,[23]

A History (1969), III, 236 n. 1; Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016), 165. The hypothesis is not, however, supported by Theoph. *Ad Autol*. III 7, 7. See Müller, *Protagoras* (1967), 151 n. 4, 158 n. 6 = (1976), 328 n. 56, 338 n. 82; Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976), 36. One should add that another list of atheists was compiled by Epicurus at the end of the 4th century BC (See Sedley, *Lucretius* [1998], 128–132), who in book XII of Περὶ φύσεως criticised the views of Prodicus, Diagoras and Critias (fr. 87 Usener = fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti^2 = I 19, 523–536 Obbink. The Greek text is in chap. V, n. 43). Cf. Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel* (1987), 36–37, 44–45; Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 350–359. See chap. IV 6, n. 245.

18 Wehrli rightly wrote, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 125 'Die Listen von ἄθεοι, womit Jacoby operiert, sollte man aus dem Spiel lassen, da hier auch Material aus zweiter Hand verwendet ist, u.a. solches aus der Komödie.'

19 *Ephes*. 2, 12 καὶ ἦτε ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

20 See Harnack, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus* (1905), 5–7.

21 Orig. *Exhort. ad mart*. 32.

22 Orig. *C. Cels*. I 1.

23 Theoph. *Ad Autol*. III 7, 6 = Euhem. T 19 Winiarczyk. See Winiarczyk, *The* '*Sacred History*' (2013), 148–149.

while Plutarch accused him of contributing to the spreading of all kinds of atheism across the world.[24]

D. D. Many scholars commit yet another mistake in their study of ancient atheism by calling people atheists without considering two key questions: 1) whether the ancients were right to call someone an atheist, 2) whether we could consider that person an atheist today. Those are two quite different questions and the answers to both do not have to be the same. Clitomachus, the creator of an extensive catalogue of atheists, was fully entitled to call Diagoras and Theodorus atheists. After all, he considered Diagoras to be the author of an atheistic book and he also knew that Diagoras had criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries, as a consequence of which he had to flee from Athens for fear of being charged with impiety. Moreover, Clitomachus may have known anecdotes illustrating Diagoras' critical attitude towards the gods. The modern scholar, on the other hand, will study the testimonies and come to the conclusion that the atheistic book was apocryphal (see chap. IV 5–6), while the anecdotes did not emerge until the Hellenistic period. Hence, the only certain fact was Diagoras' criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries and his disclosure of their secrets. But there was nothing to suggest that Diagoras' 'atheism' had any philosophical foundation. Likewise, from his point of view, Clitomachus was right to consider Theodorus to be an atheist, for he knew the Cyrenaic philosopher had been critical of popular religion and authored a book attacking the gods and religious rites. The opinion that Diagoras and Theodorus were atheists became part of the doxographic tradition (see n. 15) and it was therefore repeated by writers in later ancient times as well as modern times.

A subject of debate is the attitude towards religion of the sophist Prodicus of Ceos (c. 470 to after 400). He put forward a theory that religion emerged out of a feeling of gratitude. Moreover, he argued that there were two stages in the development of religion.[25] First people worshipped as deities those things that helped them in life, e.g. the sun, the moon, rivers, lakes, sources, meadows, crops. Later they began to worship people who had discovered useful things, e.g. Demeter and Dionysus. Gods were therefore deified bene-

24 Plut. *De Is. et Osir*. 23, 360 A = Euhem. T 15 Winiarczyk.

25 On the religious views of Prodicus, see Nestle, *Die Horen des Prodikos* (1936), 160–163, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 415–420; *idem*, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 353–355; Jaeger, *Die Theologie* (1964), 204–205, 298–299; Untersteiner, *I sofisti* (1967), II 16–18, 30–33; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 238–242; Henrichs, *Two Doxographical Notes* (1975), 107–123; *idem*, *The Sophists* (1984), 139–158; *idem*, *The Atheism of Prodicus* (1976), 15–21; Gallistl, *Teiresias in den Bakchen* (1979), 49–52; Scholten, *Die Sophistik* (2003), 136–143; Mayhew, *Prodicus* (2011), 180–193.

factors (εὐεργέται).[26] Also here those who ask the general question as to whether Prodicus was an atheist are making a mistake. The problem is much more complicated and requires answering three different questions: 1) Prodicus' attitude to religion, 2) the attitude of the ancients towards Prodicus' theory, 3) the appraisal of the sophist's theory by modern scholars. Prodicus asked the question of how belief in gods came to be, but that did not mean he consciously tried to undermine any religious cult. At least there is no evidence for this.[27] Since people wanted to know the origins of the state, the law and culture, attempts were also made to explain the origins of religion. It was only after some time that people became aware of the consequences of this theory (notably in the writings of Plato and Epicurus).[28] That is why Prodicus was included in Clitomachus' catalogue of atheists, and Cicero wrote with indignation that this sophist was destroying religion.[29] The way of speaking about religious matters had changed and thus Prodicus started to be regarded as an atheist. Today's scholars would no doubt agree with Cicero's views. Therefore, we can clearly see that the views of Prodicus should be distinguished from later interpretations of these views. The sophist may have been a devout worshipper of the gods of popular religion, but we have to accept that the conclusions which may be drawn from his theory on the human origins of religion actually can lead to the rejection of belief in gods and atheism.

2. The origins of atheism in ancient Greece

Many scholars claim that atheism understood as 'the negation of the existence of any type of deity or supernatural forces' never appeared in antiquity.[30] Some refer

26 Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 118; Philod. *PHerc. 1428*, col. II 28–III 13 (ed. Henrichs, CronErc 4, 1974, 13–14 = *De piet.* p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2; Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 18. 52.

27 Thus Versényi, *Socratic Humanism* (1963), 60; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1967), I, 770; Gigon, *Sokrates* (1979), 270–271; de Romilly, *The Great Sophists* (1992), 194 'But there is nothing to suggest that Prodicus rejected religious practice, just because he had an explanation for it.'

28 Pl. *Leg.* X 889 E Θεούς, ὦ μακάριε, εἶναι πρῶτόν φασιν οὗτοι τέχνῃ, οὐ φύσει ἀλλά τισιν νόμοις, καὶ τούτους ἄλλους ἄλλῃ, ὅπῃ ἕκαστοι ἑαυτοῖσι συνωμολόγησαν νομοθετούμενοι. On Epicurus, see n. 17. Cf. Dihle, *Das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'* (1977), 41 n. 25; Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'* (1987), 36–37, 44–45.

29 Cic. Nat. deor. I 118 'Quid Prodicus Cius, qui ea quae prodessent hominum vitae deorum in numero habita esse dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit.'

30 E.g. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, letter of 9.09.1903 in Röck, *Aristophanischer und geschichtlicher Sokrates* (1912), 180 'Unter dem Worte Atheist, das eine schlechte Neubildung ist, kann ich mir überhaupt für die Zeit des Sokrates nichts denken.'; Del Grande, *Negazione di un*

to the works of two scholars. Erich Frank (1883–1949) argued as follows: 'Atheism, as we understand it today, was unknown in Greek philosophy; for such radical denial of God is possible only when the world has lost its divine character, when God is comprehended as a Being beyond this world – as He was comprehended for the first time in the Jewish-Christian religion. Only where God is essentially apart from the world does restriction to the world mean a denial of everything divine. Of course, the Greek philosophers did not believe in the gods of popular religion ... Philosophy to them was a new religion, the religion of reason by which they hoped to replace the naive popular beliefs, and which at the end of antiquity actually brought about the collapse of paganism.'[31]

On the other hand, Karl Löwith (1897–1973) tried to explain the lack of atheism in the following way: 'If it is true that for classical philosophy the difficult relationship between knowledge and faith was not really a problem at all but perhaps the relation between knowledge and opinion as different types of knowledge, then we may assume that among Greek philosophers there were no atheists in the post-Christian sense. The distinct concepts of orthodoxy, heresy and atheism have no ancient equivalents. Heresies can only exist if there is orthodoxy, and atheists only exist when there are also believers. In antiquity atheism was not the opposite of any religious faith, but a sort of political heresy in relation to the religious stance of a given polis. Atheism was *asebeia*, and this was a crime punished by the polis.'[32]

---

ateismo ellenistico (1966), 19–34; Waldmann, *Christlicher Glaube* (1968), 360–367 ('Zum "Atheismus" in der Antike'); Kern, *Atheismus* (1975), 6–12; Dörrie, *Gottesvorstellung* (1983), 120; Charles H. Kahn, letter of 10.04.1986 'Atheism as we understand it presupposes monotheism, the belief in a single personal God ... Now strict monotheism makes this all simpler, because then the existence of God becomes a straightforward question, either Yes or Not. But (despite what one sometimes reads about Xenophanes) there is no trace of monotheism in Greece before the influence of Biblical religion: the existence of a supreme, unifying deity (whether called Zeus or Nous or One or whatever) never excludes other principles being recognised as *theos* or *theion*. So the absence of atheism in the strict sense would correspond nicely to the absence of monotheism in the strict sense.' Some scholars maintain that atheism has never existed since, regardless of era, people have always believed in something. See Joël, *Der Glaube des Atheisten* (1914), 174–191; Scheler, *Vom Ewigen im Menschen* (2000), 261–264, esp. 261 'Es besteht das Wesensgesetz: Jeder endliche Geist glaubt entweder an Gott oder an einen Götzen'; cf. p. 399 'Also der Mensch glaubt entweder an Gott, oder er glaubt an einen Götzen. Kein Drittes!'

31 Frank, *Philosophical Understanding* (1949), 32–33.

32 Löwith, *Wissen, Glaube* (1956), 14 'Wenn es richtig ist, daß für die klassische Philosophie das problematische Verhältnis von Wissen und Glaube überhaupt kein Problem war, wohl aber das Verhältnis von Wissen und Meinen, die beide verschiedene Arten des Wissens sind, dann ist zu vermuten, daß es unter den griechischen Philosophen auch keine Ungläubigen im Sinne des nachchristlichen Atheismus gab. Der Unterschied von Rechtgläubigkeit, Irrglauben und Ungläu-

Many other scholars, however, firmly believe that radical atheism did emerge by the end of the 5th century BC.[33] What should be our stance in face of these contradictory views. I would argue that E. Frank and K. Löwith are wrong to absolutize certain aspects of Greek thought. It is an obvious truth that for a long time the Greeks considered the world to have a divine character and, differently to the Judeo-Christian tradition, they believed that gods existed within this world. For some ancient thinkers, philosophy did indeed become a new religion. Löwith is also right to say that in ancient Greece the same belief was not obligatory to all and that ἀσέβεια was a political offence, because the polis was a religious and political community. Ch. Kahn (see n. 30) is also right to say that monotheism facilitated the emergence of atheism. In my opinion, however, both scholars make the serious mistake of not taking into account the fact that the ancient Greek attitude towards religion gradually changed. The turning point came with the emergence of the sophistic movement. It was, indeed, in the second half of the 5th century BC that some people began to question the validity of existing customs, laws, rites and religious beliefs, and eventually they came to the conclusion that religion was of human invention. Since the sophists came to the conclusion that religion existed νόμῳ and not φύσει, they tried to explain its origins. Prodicus maintained that religion emerged out of a sense of gratitude for useful things and for people who invented useful things (see chap. IV 1 D). However, the satyr drama Σίσυφος, either ascribed to Critias of Athens (c. 460–403) or to Euripides (c. 485–406),[34] states that a wise man convinced others that heaven

bigen hat in der Antike keine Entsprechung. Häresien kann es nur geben, wo es Orthodoxien gibt, und Atheisten nur dort, wo es auch Gläubige gibt. In der Antike ist der Atheismus keine religiöse Differenz zum Glauben, sondern eine politische Art von Häresie im Verhältnis zu den religiösen Grundlagen der polis. Atheismus war *asebeia*, und diese ein Frevel, der von der polis bestraft wurde.'

33 E.g., see Gigon, *Atheismus* (1965), 370; Fabro, *Genesi storica dell'ateismo* (1968), 9–10; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 168–170; Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 217–218; Muir, *Religion* (1985), 209; Dihle, *Philosophie und Tradition* (1986), 15.21; van der Horst, *The First Atheist* (2006), 249; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 469.

34 Critias: DK 88 B 25 = TrGF 43 F 19 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. IX 54; Euripides: Aët. *Plac*. I 7, 2 p. 298 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil*. 880 EF. Dihle, *Das Satyrspiel „Sisyphos"* (1977), 28–42, was the first to question Critias' authorship, and instead attributed the play to Euripides. Some scholars adopted this view, e.g. Mette, *Euripides* (1976), 67–70; *idem*, *Euripides* (1981/1982), 238–241; Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy* (1980), 122–137; Yunis, *The Debate* (1988), 39–46; Kahn, *Greek Religion* (1997), 249; Lämmle, *Das Satyrspiel* (2011), 660–661, but others, rightly, rejected it, incl. Solmsen, *Isis* (1979), 130 n. 25; Sutton, *Critias* (1981), 33–38; Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel* (1987), 35–45; Graf, *Greek Mythology* (1993), 191; Kannicht, *Zum Corpus* (1996), 26–27; Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 355; Runia, *Atheists* (1996), 554; Kannicht, *TrGF* (2004), V, 659; van der Horst,

was inhabited by gods who punish those who secretly commit evil deeds. The gods were therefore of human creation, and religion was a tool used to maintain social order.[35] Likewise, the philosopher Democritus of Abdera was interested in the origins of religion and proposed two theories:[36] 1) the source of belief in gods was the appearance of giant and terrifying, humanlike images (εἴδωλα),[37] 2) wise men (λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι), observing natural phenomena that struck fear and deep respect into the hearts of people, came to conclusion that heaven was inhabited by a deity who ruled the world.[38] We already know that the creators of such theories did not necessarily have to be radical atheists. It was probably not until the turn of the 4th century that the consequences of these theories were realised, i.e. not only popular religion, but also the very existence of supernatural forces in the universe were rejected on the assumption that only a material world existed, one whose creation and existence could be explained without referring to divine intervention. That is when the existence of the gods in the world was denied because it was assumed that everything resulted from the actions of φύσις and τύχη.[39] That is why in book X of the Νόμοι, Plato sharply attacked those who considered gods existed νόμῳ rather than φύσει (*Leg*. 889 E, 890 A) and presented new proof for the existence of the gods, indicating that immortal and self-moving souls are the source of all other motion.[40]

Moreover, the discussion between Socrates and Meletus in Plato's *Apology* (26 C) proves that one was able not only to deny the existence of the gods in

The First Atheist (2006), 243. The problem of the authorship: Davies, *Sisyphus* (1989), 24–28; Hoffmann, *Das Recht* (1997), 273–274; Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos* (1998), 289–302; Cipolla, *Poeti* (2003), 247–268; Scholten, *Die Sophistik* (2003), 238–241; Collard, *Tragedy, Euripides* (2007), 56–68.

35 On the 'Critias theory', see Hesk, *Deception* (2000), 179–188; O'Sullivan, *Sophistic Ethics* (2012), 167–185; Whitmarsh, *Atheistic Aesthetics* (2014), 109–124; works in Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 73–77 and n. 34 above. Naturally, we do not know if Critias supported the views expressed by the hero of his play.

36 On the attitude of Democritus towards religion, see Pfligersdorffer, *Λόγιος und die λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι* (1943/47), esp. 5–9, 19–21; McGibbon, *The Religious Thought* (1965), 385–397; Eisenberger, *Demokrits Vorstellung* (1970), 141–158; Henrichs, *Two Doxographical Notes* (1975), 93–106; Montano, *La genesi della credenza* (1984), 365–390; Cole, *Democritus* (1990), 202–205; Rechenauer, *Götter und Atome* (2005), 384–406. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 32–34.

37 Democrit. DK 68 B 166 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. IX 19.

38 Democrit. DK 68 B 30 ap. Cl. Al. *Protr*. VI 68, 5; cf. DK 68 A 75 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. IX 24.

39 Pl. *Leg*. X 886 DE, 889 A-C.

40 Pl. *Phaedr*. 245 C–246 A; *Leg*. X 891 B–899 D. See Horn, *Gottesbeweis* (1981), 953–954; Schöpsdau, *Platon, Nomoi* (2011), 396–427. On Stoic proofs for the existence of gods, see Dragona-Monachou, *The Stoic Arguments* (1976); Gerson, *God* (1990), 154–167; Meijer, *Stoic Theology. Proofs* (2007).

popular religion, but also the existence of deities in general.[41] This text is immensely important, which is why I cite it *in extenso*:

Σωκράτης· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ δύναμαι μαθεῖν πότερον λέγεις διδάσκειν μὲ νομίζειν εἶναί τινας θεούς – καὶ αὐτὸς ἄρα νομίζω εἶναι θεοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ τὸ παράπαν ἄθεος οὐδὲ ταύτῃ ἀδικῶ – οὐ μέντοι οὕσπερ γε ἡ πόλις, ἀλλὰ ἑτέρους, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὅ μοι ἐγκαλεῖς, ὅτι ἑτέρους, ἢ παντάπασί με φῂς οὔτε αὐτὸν νομίζειν θεούς τούς τε ἄλλους ταῦτα διδάσκειν.

Μέλητος· Ταῦτα λέγω, ὡς τὸ παράπαν οὐ νομίζεις θεούς.

Σωκράτης· Ὦ θαυμάσιε Μέλητε, ἵνα τί ταῦτα λέγεις; οὐδὲ ἥλιον οὐδὲ σελήνην ἄρα νομίζω θεοὺς εἶναι, ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι;

Μέλητος· Μὰ Δί', ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ἐπεὶ τὸν μὲν ἥλιον λίθον φησὶν εἶναι, τὴν δὲ σελήνην γῆν.

'Socrates: I cannot be sure whether you mean that I teach the belief that there are some gods – and therefore I myself believe that there are some gods and am not altogether an atheist, nor am I guilty of that – not, however, the gods in whom the city believes, but others, and that this is the charge against me, that they are others. Or whether you mean that I do not believe that gods exist at all, and that this what I teach to others.

Meletus: This is what I mean, that you do not believe that gods exist at all.

Socrates: You are a strange fellow, Meletus. Why do you say this? Do I not believe, as other men, that the sun and the moon are gods?

Meletus: No, by Zeus, jurymen, for he says that the sun is stone, and the moon earth.' (transl. G.M.A. Grube with my changes).

This indicates that by around 400 BC there already existed absolute atheists, i.e. ones who rejected the existence of gods and any supernatural forces. One, nevertheless, has to concede that ancient testimonies do not name any radical atheists. They only speak of the denial of the existence of the gods in popular religion. Admittedly, some scholars considered Diagoras to have been the first radical atheist, but I consider this view to be false (see chap. IV 6). Perhaps Theodorus of Cyrene was a radical atheist, but such a conclusion can only be drawn from an analysis of his philosophy.[42]

---

41 Thus Gigon, *Atheismus* (1965), 370; Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 131–157, esp. 155–157; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 237 n. 2. Differentely, Woodbury, *review of Guthrie* (1970) 352. The term νομίζειν εἶναι θεούς in this text means 'to consider that gods exist but not to believe in them'. Cf. Tate, *Greek for 'Atheism'* (1936), 3–5; *idem*, *More Greek for 'Atheism'* (1937), 3–6; Fahr, *loc. cit.*; Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (1980), 32–33; Yunis, *A New Creed* (1988), 63–66; Mikalson, *Greek Popular Religion* (2010), 11; Versnel, *Coping with the Gods* (2011), 554–559.

42 Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 90. Cf. Woodruff, *Socrates* (2011), 92 'True atheism is elusive in this period, and we do not know for certain of any thinker who denied the existence of the gods.'

Naturally, it is difficult to determine the extent to which radical atheism was widespread in the Athenian community. It was most probably limited to a small group of people who had received a philosophical and sophistic education. Plato's view, expressed in in book X of the Νόμοι, that atheism had many supporters seems exaggerated.[43] Most of the population most probably still followed traditional religion.[44]

Finally, we should answer the question of what caused the emergence of radical atheism towards the end of the 5th century BC. Although I have already mentioned the influence of the sophistic movement, the problem is more complex and deserves a somewhat more extensive explanation. It was not until the 6th century that some Presocratic philosophers (especially Xenophanes of Colophon[45] and Heraclitus of Ephesus[46]) began to criticise the anthropomorphism and immorality of the Olympian gods, as well as certain religious ceremonies. A critical attitude towards popular religion appeared later, for instance, in the works of Euripides,[47] the Cynics,[48] the Epicureans[49] and Theodorus of

43 On Plato's attitude towards atheism, see Reverdin, *La religion* (1945), 208–241; Martin, *Sur la condamnation des athées* (1951), 103–154; Wyller, *Platons Gesetz* (1957), 292–314; Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City* (1960), 470–496 ('The Law against Impiety'); Saunders, *Plato's Penal Code* (1991), 301–323; Mayhew, *Plato, Laws 10* (2008), 76–155, 192–213; Schöpsdau, *Platon, Nomoi* (2011), 368–459; Powers, *Plato's Cure for Impiety* (2014), 47–64. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1990), 133–136.

44 Plato's view is accepted by Nestle, *Atheismus* (1950), 868; Babut, *La religion* (1974), 7; Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 217; Romilly, *The Great Sophists* (1992), 142.

45 Xenophan. DK 21 B 11, 12, 14–16. See Untersteiner, *Senofane* (1956), CXIX–CXXXIII; Gigon, *Der Ursprung* (1968), 182–192; Babut, *Xénophane critique des poètes* (1974), 83–117; Lesher, *Xenophanes* (1992), 83–94; Schäfer, *Xenophanes* (1996), 146–162. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 88–89.

46 Heraclit. DK 22 B 5, 14, 15, 127, 129. See Babut, *Héraclite* (1975), 27–62; Attridge, *First-Century Cynicism* (1976), 13–23; Kindstrand, *The Cynics and Heraclitus* (1984), 172–175; Adomenas, *Heraclitus on Religion* (1999), 87–113. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 70–71.

47 See Nestle, *Euripides* (1901), esp. 87–145, 433–450; Schlesier, *Héraclès et la critique* (1985), 7–40; Lefkowitz, *Was Euripides an Atheist?* (1987), 149–166; *eadem*, *'Impiety' and 'Atheism' in Euripides'Dramas* (1989), 70–82; Riedweg, *The 'Atheistic' Fragment* (1990), 39–53. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 67–70.

48 See Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909), 79–83; Malherbe, *Pseudo-Heraclitus* (1978), 46–51; Kindstrand, *The Cynics* (1984), 172–175; Hammerstaedt, *Die Orakelkritik* (1988); Giannantoni, SSR (1990), IV, 547–550; Goulet-Cazé, *Le cynisme* (1990), 2781–2785; Hammerstaedt, *Der Kyniker Oenomaus* (1990), 2844–2850; Overwien, *Die Sprüche* (2005), 323–325. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 38–39, 80. Also see chap. IV, n. 217.

49 See Schmid, *Epikur* (1962), 782, 792–793, 807–811; Luppe, *Epikureische Mythenkritik* (1984), 109–124; Obbink, *The Atheism of Epicurus* (1989), 187–223; Giannantoni, *Epicuro e l'ateismo* (1996), 21–63. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 40–42.

Cyrene.[50] A similar attitude may also be observed in the opinions of educated people in late antiquity. It should also be mentioned that Christian apologists willingly used these stereotypical arguments against pagan religion.[51] Nevertheless, it should be stressed that criticism of the Olympian gods cannot be considered a sign of atheism. No one was obliged to accept the religious notions of Homeric poetry or Hesiod's Θεογονία, and philosophers reflected on their own theological ideas. However, every citizen was obliged to participate in the city-state's cult. Only when someone rejected or criticised this cult, could that person be accused of impiety. It is significant that testimonies say virtually nothing about the criticism of polis religions by Presocratic philosophers. Although the *theologia tripertita*[52] did not emerge until the Hellenistic period, it seems such a division may have already existed in the 6th century BC.[53]

It was also in the 6th century that there appeared a rationalistic criticism of myths which sought to explain them with real historical events.[54] This was begun by the logographer Hecataeus of Miletus in his Γενεαλογίαι,[55] and was continued by later writers, such as Hellanicus of Mytilene (5th century), Herodorus of Hera-

50 See n. 14, above.

51 See Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (1907), esp. pp. XVI ff.; Carena, *La critica della mitologia* (1923); Opelt, *Die Polemik* (1980), esp. 11–19, 73–83, 177–185; Vermander, *La polémique* (1982), 3–128; Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue* (2007), esp. 137–184; Lanzillotta, *Christian Apologists* (2010), 442–464; Winiarczyk, *Religionskritik* (2016).

52 Stoics willingly used the *theologia tripertita* concept, which 'wenigstens in ihrer Systematisierung auf Panaitios zurückgeführt werden kann' (Steinmetz, *Die Stoa* [1994], 653). Cf. Varro, *Ant. rer. div*. fr. 6 Cardauns ap. Aug. *Civ. Dei* VI 12 'Nunc propter tres theologias, quas Graeci dicunt mythicen, physicen, politicen, Latine autem dici possunt fabulosa, naturalis, civilis.' See Lieberg, *Die 'theologia tripertita'* (1973), 63–115; Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie* (1976), 276–307; Lieberg, *Die Theologia tripertita* (1982), 25–53; Dörrie, *Zu Varros Kozeption der theologia tripertita* (1986), 76–82; Dihle, *Die Theologia tripertita bei Augustin* (1996), 183–202; Cardauns, *Di gentium* (1996–2002), 373–377; Lehmann, *Varron théologien* (1997), 171–183, 193–225; Peglau, *Varro* (2003), 141–148; Rüpke, *Varro's tria genera* (2005), 107–129; *idem*, *Varro's tria genera* (2012), 172–185.

53 Jaeger, *Die Theologie* (1953) 63; Gigon, *Die Theologie* (1954), 129; Lieberg, *Die Theologia* (1982), 51–52; Cf. Mikalson, *Greek Popular Religion* (2010), 16–19.

54 See Wipprecht, *Zur Entwicklung der rationalistischen Mythendeutung* (1902–1908); Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos (*1942), 131–152; Hawes, *Rationalizing Myth* (2014).

55 See Momigliano, *Il razionalismo* (1931), 133–142, reprint in: *idem*, *Terzo contributo* (1966), 232–333; De Sanctis, *Intorno al razionalismo* (1933), 1–15, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi di storia* (1951), 3–19; Nenci, *Ecateo da Mileto* (1951), 51–58; Fertonani, *Ecateo di Mileto* (1952), 18–29; Müller, *Zur Frühgeschichte*, in *idem*, *Legende* (2006), 31–40; Bertelli, *Hecataeus* (2001), 84–89; Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* (2013), 299–300, 305–306, 665–668.

clea Pontica (c. 400–340)[56] and Palaephatus (4th century).[57] They removed from myths all miraculous and incredible elements (θαυμάσια, παράδοξα, ἄπιστα) in order to get to their historical core. Although they mainly concentrated on myths regarding heroes, sometimes they also applied the approach to myths regarding gods. This led to the desacralisation of myths[58] and allowed for providing historical explanations of myths about the Olympian gods.

In the 6th and 5th centuries, Presocratic philosophers tried to explain how and out of what the world was formed without referring to the intervention of the gods. They tried to explain natural phenomena in a way that did not include the traditional mythological interpretations.[59] Moreover, they repeated Anaxagoras' argument that heavenly bodies were not gods but made of earth and stone (Pl. *Leg*. X 886 D; XII 967 C). It was then that the gods were removed from the world. It is worth mentioning that the average Athenian considered meteorologists to be impious or even atheists, since their interpretations clearly contradicted the religious tradition.[60] Moreover, in the second half of the 5th century, the sophists started proclaiming that religion existed νόμῳ but not φύσει,[61] thus destroying the foundations of religion. Protagoras of Abdera took a sceptical view of the existence of gods (DK 80 B 4), and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon rejected divine providence (DK 85 B 8).

The emergence of atheism was, therefore, prepared for almost two centuries, during which religion was subjected to diverse types of criticism. I believe a major

56 Wipprecht, *Zur Entwicklung* (1902), I, 38–43; Borin, *Ricerche su Erodoro (*1995), 145–154; Fowler, *op. cit*., 696–698; Hawes, *Rationalizing Myth* (2014), 11–13.

57 See Festa, *Palaephatus* (1902), XXXII–LII; Wipprecht, *op. cit*., I, 11–20; von Blumenthal, *Palaiphatos* (1942), 2451–2455; Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1957), 556–559; Stern, *Palaephatus* (1996), 1–25; *idem*, *Rationalizing Myth* (1999), 215–222; Santoni, *Palefato* (2000), 9–42; Brodersen, *'Das aber ist eine Lüge !'* (2005), 44–57; Berdozzo, *Götter, Mythen* (2011), 32–34; Santoni, *Palaiphatos* (2012), 85–89; Hawes, *Rationalizing Myth* (2014), 37–91, 227–238.

58 Cf. Bremmer, *Manteis, Magic* (2010), 29–30 'Nevertheless, we must not fail to note that these rationalising changes also would have contributed to the secularisation of the inherited mythological tradition.'

59 See Kirk, Raven, Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1983), 480–481, 489 (index s.v. cosmogony, cosmology, meteorology); Algra, *The Beginnings of Cosmology* (1999), 45–65; Wright, *Presocratic Cosmologies* (2008), 413–433. Cf. Pl. *Leg*. X 889 BC, 891 C. See Tate, *On Plato: Laws X 889 CD* (1936), 48–54; Muth, *Studien zu Platons „Nomoi"* (1956), 140–153; de Mahieu, *La doctrine des athées* (1963), 5–24 and (1964), 16–47; Schöpsdau, *Platon, Nomoi* (2011), 384–390.

60 See chap. II 2 A, n. 15.

61 On the antithesis νόμος – φύσις, see Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (1945); Pohlenz, *Nomos und Physis* (1953), 418–438, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften* (1965), II, 341–360; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 55–134; Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (1981), 111–130; Bremer, *Von den frühen Philosophen* (2013), 959–962.

role was played by four types of critique: a) criticism of the anthropomorphism and immorality of the Olympian gods, b) rationalistic criticism of myths, c) a materialistic and mechanistic concept of the creation of the world as well as a natural way of explaining natural phenomena, d) considering religion to be of human invention. It seems that we cannot absolutize any of the above reasons and consider one to be the most important.[62] It was only when they were all put together, did they combine and create an intellectual atmosphere which towards the end of the 5th century BC led to the emergence of the first radical atheists. We cannot rule out that the long-lasting plague in Athens (430–427/26) during the Peloponnesian War may have also inclined some people to deny the existence of gods, since the victims were not only bad and impious people but also those who were pious and good.[63]

I consider false the two diametrically opposite views of scholars of ancient Greek philosophy and religion: 1) atheism never existed in pre-Christian Greece, 2) already in the 6th century BC Presocratic philosophers supported atheism. On the other hand, the theory that atheism, as the rejection of all gods and supernatural phenomena, appeared in Athens towards the end of the 5th century BC does seem probable, as this is testified in book X of Plato's Νόμοι. Nevertheless, this atheism was limited to a small group of people and the majority of society remained faithful to the religion of their polis.

3. Reasons for Diagoras' atheism

Already in antiquity there was wonderment that Diagoras was the author of both pious poetry and an atheistic book. People tried to explain it in various ways. Aristoxenus of Tarentum rejected the atheistic book tradition and only consid-

62 Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 85–87 stressed the antithesis νόμος – φύσις, whereas Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 228–232 attached particular importance to the rationalistic interpretation of myths. Also see Bremmer, *Literacy* (1982), 43–55.

63 Thuc. II 53, 4 θεῶν δὲ φόβος ἢ ἀνθρώπων νόμος οὐδεὶς ἀπεῖργε, τὸ μὲν κρίνοντες ἐν ὁμοίῳ καὶ σέβειν καὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ πάντας ὁρᾶν ἐν ἴσῳ ἀπολλυμένους. See Mikalson, *Religion and the Plague* (1984), 217–225. He supposes (p. 219) that public order broke down for only a few weeks, when the plague was at its very worst. Flower, *Athenian Religion* (2009), 16–18 stressed that when the plague subsided, traditional religious ceremonies were resumed. See Longrigg, *Death and Epidemic Disease* (2000), 62; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 123–129 ('Seuchen als göttliches Strafgericht'); *idem*, *Fear* (2014), 48–50, 201–203. It has long been noticed that belief in the gods was undermined by the fact that wicked people were often successful in life, whereas noble people frequently encountered misfortune. See Appendix II (C*ontra deos testimonium*).

ered the pious poetry to be authentic (see chap. II 4). Another interpretation was more popular. In the Hellenistic period two anecdotes explain why a pious lyric poet became an atheist.[64] According to one version, a certain poet stole a paean written by Diagoras. The thief solemnly swore that he had not appropriated the poem, but soon presented it as his own and achieved a great success.[65] Another version states that this was not a paean, but a sum of money left in deposit (παρακαταθήκη).[66] Diagoras naturally expected the perjurer to be punished by the gods. When this did not happen, he stopped believing in their existence and became an atheist.[67] These anecdotes of course have no historical value and were the invention of Hellenistic biographers.[68] Here we are dealing with a well-known theme, particularly often discussed in Hellenistic philosophy by the opponents and supporters of the notion of providence. For a long time people had been troubled by the thought that villains enjoyed happy lives and were not deservedly punished by the gods. This lack of punishment led some to doubt or even stop believing in the existence of just gods.[69] A similar train of thought was probably also applied in the case of Diagoras.

Some scholars looked for the reasons for Diagoras' atheism in the theory that he was a student of philosophers or that he read their works. This hypothesis is

64 We may, nevertheless, ask the question as to whether writing poetry which included myths and religious terminology really reflected the piety of the poet. Already Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 132, maintained that Diagoras could write lyric poetry and at the same time sharply criticise the Eleusinian Mysteries. Cf. the dithyrambic poet Cinesias, who was also accused by contemporaries of impiety (see n. 255). It seems to me that we are unable to determine the religiosity of Diagoras on the basis of five verses from two works (F 1–2). We should remember that for many years now there has been a debate over the religiosity of Pindar. See, for example, Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars* (1957).

65 Suda s.v. Διαγόρας (II 53 Adler) = T 9 A.

66 *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 830 b, 830 f (T 6 A); *Schol. Cl. Al. Protr.* II 24, 2 (I 304 Stählin = T 26); Ioh. Tzetzes, *Comment.* in *Aristoph. Nub.* 829a (T 11). Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 53 (T 57) generally writes that Diagoras was hurt by someone (ἀδικηθεὶς δὲ ὑπό τινος).

67 Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 53 (T 57) μεθηρμόσατο εἰς τὸ λέγειν μὴ εἶναι θεόν; *Schol. Cl. Al. Protr.* II 24, 2 (I 304 Stählin = T 26) εἰς ἀθεότητα ἐτράπη; *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 830 f (T 6 A) εἰς τὸ ἄθεος εἶναι ἔδραμεν; Tzetzes, *Comment.* in *Aristoph. Nub.* 829 a (T 11) εἰς ἐσχάτην ἐτράπη ἀσέβειαν.

68 See Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 16 ll. 44–45 'I will leave it an open question whether they (scil. the Hellenistic biographers) repeated older explanations or invented an answer to a problem first raised by Aristoxenos.' Some scholars, nevertheless, presume that an experienced injustice could indeed have been the cause of Diagoras' atheism: Versnel, *Religious Mentality* (1981), 40; Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 218; Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1989), 454; cf. p. 636 n. 14 'but Diagoras, I hope, raised that banal puzzlement to an intellectual level and used it to ground an argument for atheism'; van der Horst, *The First Atheist* (2006), 248.

69 See the testimonia in Appendix II (*Contra deos testimonium*).

supposedly supported by the following arguments: a) in antiquity Diagoras was considered to be a student of Democritus (see chap. III 2, n. 25), b) chronographers connected Diagoras' ἀκμή with that of the philosophers (see chap. III 1), c) Aristophanes presented Socrates in the *Clouds* as a natural philosopher and gave him the nickname Μήλιος (see chap. II 2 A). This would imply that Diagoras shared the philosophical views expressed by Socrates in the comedy.

In the 18th century scholars pointed to the association of Diagoras with Leucippus and Democritus. Johann Franz Buddaeus (1667–1729) believed that Leucippus, Democritus and Diagoras were the continuators of Eleatic philosophy,[70] but lately this view was rightly rejected by Manfred Kraus.[71] Salomon Luria (1891–1964), on the other hand, put forward the theory that there existed a tendency to establish διαδοχαί of famous atheists: Leucippus-Democritus-Diagoras-Socrates.[72] Others assumed that Diagoras became an atheist because he had studied the philosophy of atomism.[73] On the other hand, Martin Ostwald (1922–2010) maintained that the sophists introduced Diagoras to the Ionian philosophy of nature. That was why Aristophanes was entitled to call Socrates Μήλιος.[74] To me, nevertheless, all these hypotheses seem unconvincing. Their proponents are wrong to tacitly assume that the poet changed his convictions and started studying philosophy after the gods had failed to punish a perjurer. In my opinion, the allusions to Diagoras in the *Clouds* may be explained quite differently. The views expressed by Socrates in the comedy indicated his impiety. That is why Aristophanes gave him nickname which was the birthplace of another notoriously impious person, Diagoras.

Since Diagoras was already known as an ἄθεος in the 420s, two other hypotheses should be considered invalid: a) Diagoras' atheism was a response to the brutal treatment of the inhabitants of Melos after the city was captured by the

70 E.g. Buddaeus, *Theses theologicae de atheismo* (1722), 55.

71 Kraus, *Parmenides* (2013), 450.

72 Luria, *Democritea* (1970), 404.

73 Kock, *Ausgewählte Komödien* (1898), 89 'Später ward er (scil. Diagoras) durch das Studium der Atomisten ein entschiedener Gottesleugner'; Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 59 (Diagoras adopted atheism from Democritus). See chap. III 1, n. 7 (Diagoras' association with Leucippus), chap. III 2, n. 26 (the relation between atheists and Democritus) and chap. III 2, n. 28 (Diagoras as the student of Democritus).

74 Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty* (1986), 276 'Diagoras was reputed to have absorbed enough Ionian science, presumably from the sophists, to have been tarred in Athens with the same brush as Anaxagoras.' Moreover, he believed (p. 276 n. 290) that the Ionian tradition is supported by the anecdote that Democritus purchased Diagoras as a slave and made him his pupil. See my comments on this anecdote in chap. III 2.

Athenians in the winter of 416/415 (see chap. III 2),[75] b) Diagoras started criticising the Eleusinian Mysteries only after the passing of the ἀπαρχαί decree, i.e. on requiring all poleis of the Delian League to submit their first fruits of grain to Athens in 416/415.[76] Bernhard Smarczyk[77] argues that the Athenians wanted to convert the Eleusinian Mysteries into a central cult of the Delian League and thus strengthen the position of Athens. He wonders whether this religious policy of Athens did not incline Diagoras to criticise the Eleusinian Mysteries.[78] He, nevertheless, concedes that the sources do not tell us anything about Diagoras' political motives. Moreover, we should stress that Diagoras must have been known as an impious person since at least the first half of the 420s, because an allusion to this impiety is made by Aristophanes in the *Clouds*, which was performed in 423 (see chap. II 2 A). Therefore Diagoras must have criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries much earlier. It should be added that we do not know for sure when the ἀπαρχαί decree was actually passed, as is admitted by the authors of its edition, Russell Meiggs and David Lewis.[79] I cannot discuss this complicated problem here as it would take up too much space.[80] I shall only mention various hypotheses: 1) The decree was passed in the 440s in association with the religious policy of Pericles and the plan to organise a Pan-Hellenic congress. 2) C. 435, when the decree was supposed to confirm the hegemony of Athens on the eve of the Peloponnesian War. 3) During the final phase of the Archidamian War (c. 422). 4) During the Peace of Nicias (418– 416/415). If someone wished to synchronise Diagoras' criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries with the passing of the ἀπαρχαί decree, the third hypothesis proposed by Maureen B. Cavanaugh (c. 435) would be the most appropriate.[81]

---

75 Thus for example Burckhardt, *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* (1898), I, 298 n. 3; Nestle, *Die griechische Religiosität* (1933), II, 80; Auffarth, *Aufnahme* (1995), 341; Bremmer, *Religious Secrets* (1995), 75; *idem*, *Atheism* (2007), 18.

76 IG I³, 78 = ML 73 = GHI I² 74 = LSCG 5 = HGIÜ 123. Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik* (1990), 252 n. 277 'Die achte Prytanie des Jahres 416/5 fällt somit ungefähr in den März/April 415.'

77 Smarczyk, *op. cit*., 167–298.

78 Smarczyk, *op. cit*., 286–287. Similarly, Auffahrt, *Aufnahme* (1995), 340–341.

79 Meiggs, Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (1988), 219 'if we cannot date it. This is a frustrating example". They themselves propose 422 (?), which has been accepted by many scholars, e.g. Mattingly, *What are the Right Dating* (1999), 121.

80 A good *Forschungsbericht* in: Smarczyk, *op. cit*., 224–252; Cavanagh, *Eleusis and Athens* (1996), 39–71.

81 Cavanaugh, *op. cit*., 73–95 (in IG I³ 78 financial matters are still dealt with by ἱεροποιοί, whereas in IG I³ 32 in 432 there is talk of ἐπιστάται). Smarczyk, *op. cit*. 230 ff. rejected the arguments of the American scholar and accepted the year 415 (He used the then still unpublished version

4. Books attributed to Diagoras

In antiquity, Diagoras was considered the author of two prose books: Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι and Φρύγιοι λόγοι. Some scholars claimed that the two titles concerned the same work,[82] while others assumed that Diagoras wrote two different books.[83] Many scholars, however, deny that Diagoras was the author of either work.[84] The Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι title has been passed on to us by the *Suda*,[85] and this information was from Ὀνοματολόγος by Hesychius of Miletus (6th century AD), while the Φρύγιοι λόγοι were mentioned by Tatian, a Christian author living in the 2nd century,[86] as well as Al-Mubaššir, an Arab philosopher of the 11th century, who probably indirectly acquired this information from the writings of the Neoplatonist Porphyry (3rd/4th century)[87] [see chap. II 8 A]. In my

---

of a dissertation written under the supervision of Kevin Clinton at Cornell University, 1980). See n. 76. Similarly Furley, *Andokides* (1996), 38 n. 26 'The argument hardly seems decisive'. ; Rosivach, *review of Cavanaugh* (1997). The Cavanaugh hypothesis was, however, accepted by Stavrianopoulou in: Chaniotis, Mylonopoulos, Stavrianopoulou, *Epigraphic Bulletin* (1999), 230 and Clinton, *Eleusis* (2005), 37–40 (nr 28 ab) ['ca. 440–435']; *idem*, *The Eleusinian Sanctuary* (2009), 55 (c. 435).

82 Thus, e.g., Fabricius, *Bibliotheca* (1790), I, 627; II, 656; Gomperz, *Griechische Denker* (1922), I, 482; Nestle, *Vom Mythos* (1942), 417; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 494. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 28 l. 9 – 29 l. 27 believed that Diagoras entitled his book Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι, and the term Φρύγιοι λόγοι in Tatian's text: 'is not meant as a title at all, but as a characterization of the book – a veritable "Phrygian writing" – from the view-point of a Christian writer.' On the other hand, Meier, *Diagoras* (1833), 445 and Mounier, *Disputatio* (1838), 84, believed that the real title was Φρύγιοι λόγοι. Woodbury, *op. cit*., 203, considered the possibility that the work by Diagoras was entitled Ἀποπυργίζοντες ἢ Φρύγιοι λόγοι, but ultimately did not support this theory. Previously he decidedly rejected the view of Jacoby, *op. cit*., 29 ll. 15–17.

83 Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1845), 183 and Münchenberg, *De Diagora* (1877), 23–25, 30, were of the opinion that Φρύγιοι λόγοι criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries, whereas Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was against the gods.

84 E.g. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 84; Drachmann, *Atheism* (1922), 84; Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (1926), 237; Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 62; Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 125–126.

85 Suda s.v. Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, οὓς ἔγραψε Διαγόρας ὁ Ἄθεος, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης (I 315 Adler) = T 67 A; Suda, s.v. Διαγόρας (II 53 Adler) = T 9 A; Suda s.v. πυργίσκοι (IV 274 Adler) = T 67 B; cf. Ps.-Hesych. Mil. *De vir. illustr*. 17 (T 9 B).

86 Tat. *Or. ad Graec*. 27 (T 68) Διαγόρας Ἀθηναῖος ἦν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτον ἐξορχησάμενον τὰ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις μυστήρια τετιμωρήκατε καὶ τοῖς Φρυγίοις αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἐντυγχάνοντες ἡμᾶς μεμισήκατε.

87 According to Al-Mubaššir (T 10), the book was found after the death of Diagoras, 'written in the language of the inhabitants of Phrygia, full of mockery of matters concerning the gods.'

opinion, the fact that the ancient sources refer to only one book is very significant. We cannot rule out the possibility that Aristoxenus of Tarentum may have heard of the book in the second half of the 4th century, though Albert Henrichs, who published the last edition of Philodemus' text, believed that the Peripatetic had in mind Diagoras' reputation as an impious person.[88] Some scholars suppose that the book ascribed to Diagoras may have been known by Epicurus,[89] who in book XII of the treatise Περὶ φύσεως criticised Prodicus, Diagoras and Critias,[90] but this cannot be conclusively proven.[91] There is also no evidence to prove that Diagoras' work was known to Euripides,[92] Aristophanes,[93] Critias[94] and Plato.[95]

Without doubt, this was the work cited by Tatian. 'The language of the inhabitants of Phrygia' phrase probably resulted from a mistranslation of the title Φρύγιοι λόγοι.

88 Philod. *PHerc. 1428*, col. XI–XII 12 = T 69. See chap. II 4, where the various interpretations of the papyrus are extensively discussed. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 25 ll. 35–38 and Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 207 n. 83 assumed that Aristoxenus knew Diagoras' book.

89 Thus Jacoby, *op. cit*., 25 ll. 34–35 and Woodbury, *loc. cit*. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 30 ll. 23–43 considered it probable that Diagoras' book may have had a certain influence on Epicurean writers, e.g. Lucret. II 7–8 (= Diag. Imitationes 4)

'sed nihil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere
edita doctrina sapientum templa serena.'

However, Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 204 n. 74, correctly considered it speculation which could not be proved.

90 Philod. *De piet*. I 19, 523–530 Obbink (T 39) = Epicurus fr. 87 Usener, fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti[2]. The Greek text is cited in chap. V, n. 43.

91 Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 352 assumes that Epicurus could have read about Diagoras' book in Τῶν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἱστορία by the Peripatetic Eudemus of Rhodes.

92 Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (1884), III, 473 n. 24; Nestle (*Euripides* [1901], 415 n. 2 and 447 n. 103; *Kritias* [1903] 98 n. 4; *Vom Mythos* [1942], 417 n. 81) and Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016), 113 assumed that Euripides made an allusion to Diagoras' work in a damaged fragment of the tragedy Βελλεροφόντης fr. 286, 15 Kannicht (TrGF V 354) τὰ θεῖα πυργοῦσιν αἱ κακαί τε συμφοραί. Jacoby, *op. cit*., 44 n. 200 and 48 n. 250 did not rule out such a possibility, but Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 133, rightly rejected Bergk's hypothesis.

93 Nestle, *Legenden* (1936), 259 n. 7, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 548 n. 52 saw an allusion to Diagoras in the term ὦ καλλίπυργον σοφίαν (Arist. *Nub*. 1024 = Diag. I 2). Jacoby (*op. cit*., 32 n. 5; cf. p. 30 ll. 27–29), rightly, considered this to be rather doubtful.

94 W. Nestle's hypothesis on the influence of Diagoras' work on the 'Critias theory' in the satyr drama *Sisyphus* (*Kritias* [1903], 101, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* [1948], 282; *Vom Mythos* [1942], 416; *Atheismus* [1950], 867) rejected Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 176 n. 1, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 76 n. 51; Battegazzore, *Crizia* (1962), 307 n.; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 244 n. 3; van der Horst, *The First Atheist* (2006), 248–249.

95 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 44 n. 200 'I have advisedly left aside the question as unanswerable for us … whether Plato knew the book of Diagoras.'

A. Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι

a. Interpretation of the title

The title Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι [96] is so difficult to interpret because the verb ἀποπυργίζω is a *hapax legomenon*. Perhaps only U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff admitted that he did not understand the title,[97] while other scholars tried to provide an explanation, at the same time realising it was uncertain and very much open to discussion. Before the publication of Eudore Derenne's book in 1930, there prevailed an opinion that in Diagoras' time the ἀπό prefix added the meaning of destruction to the given verb. It was believed that this concurred with Diagoras' radical atheism and generally no one bothered to conduct a detailed semantic analysis of other words with ἀπό which were used in the 5th and 4th centuries BC.[98] Ἀποπυργίζω was therefore translated as *destroy the towers (scil. of the gods)* or *cast down (scil. the gods) from their towers*.[99] It was E. Derenne who first came to the conclusion that in the 5th century BC ἀποπυργίζω did not yet express destruction.[100] He argued that ἀπογεφυρόω (Hdt. II 99) meant *to defend or secure with a dike or dam*, ἀποικοδομέω (Thuc. I 134, 2; VII 73, 1) meant *to barricade*, and ἀποστεγάζω *to conceal again or mask*.[101] Especially significant was meaning

96 The hypothesis of Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (1916), II, 375, that the correct form is Καταπυργίζοντες λόγοι is unconvincing. Accordingly, Diagoras was to have imitated the title of Protagoras' work Καταβάλλοντες λόγοι. We should also reject the view of Sitzler, *Jahresbericht* (1907), 206, that the title Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι resulted from a corrupted form of Ἀποφρυγίζοντες λόγοι. He compared two verbs: ἀποφρυγίζειν and ἀποσκυθέζειν.

97 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 82 n. 2. LSJ does not give the meaning of the ἀποπυργίζω.

98 Although Dieterich, *Die präpositionalen Präfixe* (1909), 87–158, published an extensive study of words compounding with ἀπό, he did not take this variant into account when the prefix ἀπό meant destruction. On pp. 105–115 he analysed words with ἀπό 'in privater und negativer Bedeutung'.

99 See, e.g., Fabricius, *Bibliotheca* (1790), I, 627 n. aa 'de turre praecipitantes'; Bergk, *Commentationum* (1838), 173 'equidem opinor Diagoram ita hunc librum appellavisse, quoniam in eo divina numina quasi de summo fastigio deiecit'; Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (1848), 183 'sermones numina divina destruentes sive demolientes'; Drachmann, *Atheism* (1922), 32 'literally, destructive considerations'; Derenne, *Les procès* (1930), 61 'discours qui démolissent les tours'; Nestle, *Vom Mythos* (1942), 416 'Entfestigende Reden'; Meyer, *Geschichte* (1954), 752 n. 1 'vom Thurm stürzende Reden'; Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 180, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 79 'discorsi che demoliscono gli dei'; Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016), 113 'Arguments That Knock Down Towers'.

100 Derenne, *op. cit.*, 59–60.

101 Ps.-Aristot. *Probl. phys*. 924 a 37; Theophr., *De caus. plant*. V 6, 5. Not till Strabo VIII 3, 30 p. 353 and *Evang. Marci* 2, 4 was the verb ἀποστεγάζω used in the sense 'remove roof, uncover'.

of the word ἀποτειχίζω,[102] i.e. *to isolate with a wall, fortify or raise fortifications*, because this verb has a very similar construction to ἀποπυργίζω. Aristophanes used the term ὁ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποτειχίσας (*Aves* 1576) not in the sense of *casting the gods off the wall*, but *to block out the gods*. It was not until Polyaenus and Arrian, writers living in the 2nd century AD, that the term ἀποτειχίζω was used to mean *to storm or destroy fortifications*.[103] After a semantic analysis of words using the prefix ἀπό, Derenne came to the conclusion that in the 5th and 4th centuries BC ἀποπυργίζω meant to *defend with towers*.[104]

F. Jacoby accepted E. Derenne's view and translated the title Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι as *Fortifying Arguments*. He, however, noted that to this should be added 'the gods or mankind': *Arguments fortifying mankind against the gods* or *Arguments blockading the gods*.[105] He referred to two fragments in Aristophanes' comedy where terms regarding the art of fortification are used metaphorically.[106] In his opinion, this shows that in the 5th century BC the word ἀποπυργίζω could have been used metaphorically.

Leonard Woodbury, on the other hand, felt that Derenne's linguistic argument, accepted by Jacoby, was not entirely convincing.[107] That is why he does not rule out the possibility that the traditional meaning of the prefix was already present in the 5th century BC, although he does concede that he has no evidence to prove this and the linguistic analogy speaks against it. Woodbury has failed to support his opinion with any serious argument. As such we cannot consider his reasoning that although πύργος and τεῖχος are synonyms, their meaning is not identical, and that the meaning of ἀποπυργίζω did not have to have the same meaning as ἀποτειχίζω. Of course, the meanings did not have to evolve in the same way, but it is highly probable that they did and nothing suggests the contrary. Woodbury proposed a new interpretation of the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι title, which he himself admits, *cannot be more than a possibility*, and which I consider to be quite unconvincing. He said it was possible that the verbs *ἀποπυργόω and ἀποπυργίζω meant *to supply the battlements*, because they belong to the same group as ἀπογεισόω (*to provide a ledge*) and ἀποθριγκόω (*to furnish with a coping*), which are well attested in the 4th century

102 Hdt. VI 36, 2; IX 8, 2; Thuc. I 64, 1; IV 130, 7; Xen. *Hellen*. I 3, 4.

103 Polyaen. *Strat*. I 3, 5; Arrian. *Epict. diatr*. IV 1, 88. Ἀποτείχισις in Thuc. I 65, 1, means 'isolate with wall', and in Polyaen. I 3, 5 it means 'to destroy fortifications'.

104 Such a meaning is already given in ThGL I 2, 1629 'Ἀποπυργίζω. Suidas. Videtur autem significare Turribus defendo.' Cf. Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary* (2015), 266.

105 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 30 ll. 13–23. His hypothesis was accepted by Katz, *The Birds* (1976), 373, and Corsini, *Gli 'Uccelli'* (1986), 110 n. 58. Cf. Montanari, *loc. cit*., 'Defensive Speeches'.

106 Aristoph. *Nub*. 1024–1025; *Aves* 1576. Cf. Eur. *Belleroph*. fr. 286, 15 Kannicht (text in n. 92).

107 Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 204–206.

BC.[108] He decided that the most appropriate meaning of the words was to complete a wall, especially that of ἀποπυργίζω 'might be used by extension of any building, or any act of completion or culmination'. In his opinion, the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι might mean *The Summing Up*. That, he argued, would perfectly suit the title of the autobiography of someone who had become an atheist, a retrospective book which was to be published after the author's death. Nevertheless, Woodbury conceded that 'positive confirmation is lacking, and proof impossible.'[109] We should note that information on the book being published posthumously comes from the account of the Arab author Al-Mubaššir (T 10), which includes various mistakes (see chap. II 8 A).

Ancient sources provide no plausible information on the contents of the book. Although the *Suda* states that Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι concerned Diagoras' loss of belief in the gods,[110] F. Jacoby pointed to the fact that this information is not a bibliographic note derived from Callimachus' Πίναξ, since it lacks the opening words of the book or the στίχοι (i.e. the length of the book). The information in the *Suda* (s.v. *Diagoras* =T 9 A) is clearly of a biographical character, for it is linked with the anecdote which explains that Diagoras converted to atheism as a result of the perjury of another poet.[111] It seems probable that the *Suda* note was written on the basis of anecdotes from a Hellenistic biography. L. Woodbury accepts such a hypothesis as plausible, but considers yet another possibility. The book could have been a collection of anecdotes on the reasons for Diagoras' atheism. In such a case, the title could have been *How I Lost My Faith*, and the book would not necessarily have been a theological discussion on the nature of the gods. This hypothesis would help to explain why ancient sources do not provide any arguments justifying Diagoras' atheism, though he was often mentioned as a typical atheist.[112] Nevertheless, I feel that it is best to refrain from such speculation, because all attempts to reconstruct the contents of this book are doomed to failure.[113]

In a review of my doctoral thesis (12.04.1976) Marian Plezia (1917–1996) proposed yet another interpretation of the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι title. It is based on

108 Xenoph. *Memor*. I 4, 6 i IG XI 2, 144 A 84.

109 Woodbury, *op. cit*., 205–206.

110 Suda s.v. Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους (I 315 Adler) = T 67 A; Suda s.v. Διαγόρας (II 53 Adler) = T 9 A; Suda s.v. πυργίσκοι (IV 274 Adler) = T 67 B. See citations in n. 85 and 114.

111 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 46 n. 227. Similarly Woodbury, *op. cit*., 200.

112 Woodbury, *op. cit*., 200–201 with n. 58.

113 See an extensive discussion in Jacoby, *op. cit*., 26–27 on the polemical and philosophical nature of Diagoras' book. Cf. the reconstruction of Diagoras'work proposed by Nestle, *Atheismus* (1950), 867.

the premise that the information in the *Suda* (s.v. πυργίσκοι = T 67 B) has grammatical origins and the final words of the testimony ἄθεος ἦν τὸ πρότερον indicate that Diagoras rejected impious views.[114]

'The grammatical origins … are indicated by the *pyrgiskoi* lemma, which should explain the verb *apopyrgidzo*. This theme, therefore, could reflect the investigations of Alexandrian grammarians, which is why it is worthy of attention. Apart from the noun *pyrgiskos* (chest) cited by source, which we know only from the Christian era, we may add another word with the same meaning, namely *pyrgis*, which was already testified by Herodas. *Apopyrgidzo* (in relation to *pyrgis* as *aposphragidzo* is to *sphragis*) would therefore mean 'to open', and *apopyrgidzontes logoi* 'opening/revealing words', which now may easily be associated with the well testified tradition of Diagoras revealing the Eleusinian Mysteries. The counterargument to this could be that the *pyrgis* and *pyrgiskos* are known to us only from times later than those of Diagoras. And the answer would be that, firstly, this does not prove these words did not also exist in Diagoras' day, and, secondly, that both words are etymologically associated with the word *pyrgos* (tower), and in antiquity as well as for a long time afterwards towers were not only a part of fortifications, but also a place where precious items were deposited in chests for safekeeping. That is why out of *pyrgos* one could make a derivative noun *pyrgis*, meaning chest or cache. Later, during the Roman Empire period, when only the curious title of the book supposedly written by Diagoras was known, attempts were made to link it with the author's notorious atheism, who was either recanting his atheism and "withdrawing from the chest" faith in the gods, or, conversely, disheartened by the impunity of the imposter, "hiding it in the chest". For *apopyrgidzo* may have had two meanings, just as *aposphragidzo* may mean "seal" or "unseal"'.

Plezia's interpretation is immensely interesting, but I think it doubtful the πυργίσκοι lemma was really an echo of the studies of Alexandrian grammarians. Ada Adler (1878–1946), in her edition of the *Suda*, noted that the first part of the lemma originates from Ὀνειροκριτικά by Artemidorus of Ephesus (2nd century AD), while the other part, which speaks of Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι, was taken from Ὀνοματολόγος by Hesychius of Miletus (6th century AD). One cannot rule out the possibility that the author of the *Suda* himself linked the two elements into one lemma (which would make the linking of ἀποπυργίζω with πυργίσκος – πυργίς unjustified). Moreover, I am not convinced if the short sentence at the end of the

114 Suda s.v. πυργίσκοι (IV 274 Adler) = T 67 B Πυργίσκοι καὶ Θησαυροφυλάκια· σκεύη κατ' οἶκον. καὶ Ἀποπυργίζω. Διαγόρας ἔγραψε τοὺς Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης· ἄθεος ἦν τὸ πρότερον.

lemma entitles us to say that a certain tradition spoke of the return of the atheist Diagoras to the faith of his fathers. Nevertheless, I admit it is very hard to convincingly explain this sentence (see chap. II 7).

Among the above cited interpretations of the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι title, I find those of F. Jacoby and Plezia to be the most interesting. We cannot determine, however, which of the two is closer to the truth, because ἀποπυργίζω is a *hapax legomenon* and we cannot compare its use in any other context.

b. The question of authorship

The question of the authorship of Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι has for a long time stimulated heated debates. E. Derenne considered it a forgery from the Roman Empire period, because the form resembles the titles of sophistic works, such as Καταβάλλοντες (scil. λόγοι) by Protagoras of Abdera and Ὑπερβάλλοντες (scil. λόγοι) by Thrasymachus of Chalcedon.[115] F. Jacoby, on other hand, decidedly supported the authenticity of the book ascribed to Diagoras and gave several arguments (pp. 25–26) to justify his stance.

1. The issues raised in Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι were actually very pertinent to the second half of the 5th century BC.
2. It is unlikely that the book was written in the 4th century BC.
3. There were other people to whom the atheistic book could be ascribed, e.g. the dithyrambic poet Cinesias, whom comedy playwrights quite frequently accused of impiety.

I, nevertheless, consider these arguments to be unconvincing. I remind the reader that the earliest testimony of Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι is found in the 10th-century Byzantine encyclopaedia (see n. 85). Moreover, it is debatable whether Aristoxenus of Tarentum and Epicurus really read the work attributed to Diagoras.[116] Very important information is found in the Pseudo-Lysias speech (*Or*. 6, 17), which accuses Andocides of being more impious than Diagoras, who 'committed impiety by speaking against holy things and festivals that were foreign to him' (transl. S.C. Todd). Above (chap. II 3) I have tried to show that here the speaker is not alluding to a work that was written by Diagoras. This suggests that around the year 400

115 Protag. (DK 80 B 1) ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. VII 60; Thrasym. (DK 85 B 7) ap. Plut. *Quaest. conv*. I 2, 3, 616 D. However, I am not entirely certain if these titles are original, since the custom of authors using titles did not emerge until around 400 BC. See Schmalzriedt, *ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ* (1970).

116 On Aristoxenus, see chap. II 4 and chap. IV, n. 88. On Epicurus, see chap. IV 4 with n. 89–91.

Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was not known in Athens. Therefore, the work attributed to Diagoras probably did not start being circulated with his name until the first half of 4th century BC. Although such forgeries were rarer in that time than in the Hellenistic period, the several known examples are probably sufficient to make it possible for a book to be falsely attributed to Diagoras in the 4th century.[117]

However, another argument speaks against the authorship of Diagoras. The author of a prose book promoting radical atheism and attacking belief in the gods would have in all probability been a philosopher or at least someone with a philosophical education. Yet we have no reliable evidence that Diagoras belonged to any group of philosophers (see chap. III 1, n. 5). Most of the scholars writing about philosophy in the 5th century BC do not mention Diagoras as a philosopher or even directly state that he was not a philosopher.[118] Only a few have actually claimed that he was a philosopher because a branch of the ancient tradition does associate him with Presocratic philosophers (see chap. III 1).[119] But this tradition began in a later period, when an atheistic book ascribed to Diagoras started being circulated and the supposed author was included in catalogues of atheists.[120] Well testified is

117 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 25 ll. 41–42 firmly stated that 'A forgery of this kind ... is unthinkable for the 4th century' and gave only example of a 4th-century BC forgery: Anaximenes of Lampsacus published a work entitled Τρικάρανος under the name of Theopompus of Chios (FGrHist 72 F 20–21). Further examples of 4th-century forgeries are provided by Woodbury, *op. cit.*, 209 n. 87. E.g. Heraclides Ponticus published tragedies under the name of Thespis (fr. 13a Wehrli = fr. 1 Schütrumpf ap. Diog. Laert. V 92). On the other hand, the tragedy *Parthenopaios* was ascribed to Sophocles (Diog. Laert. V 92) by Dionysius Metathemenos vel Heracleotes (TrGF II 282 [no. 113] = SVF I 425) or by Spintharos (TrGF II 168–169 [no. 40 T 3]). Moreover, in the 4th century the tragedy *Rhesos* was attributed to Euripides. See, e.g., Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie* (1954), 188; Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung* (1972), 527–528.

118 E.g. Praechter, *Die Philosophie* (1926), 129; Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 126; Woodbury, *op. cit.*, 209; Kerferd, Flashar, *Die Sophistik* (1998), 95–96 'Diagoras kann nicht eigentlich als Philosoph oder Sophist bezeichnet werden ..., da er nur in dieser einzigen dilettantischen Prosaschrift philosophische Gedanken veröffentlichte. Die vielleicht noch nicht einmal seine eigenen, sondern Zusammenfassungen von Ansichten anderer Denker waren.'

119 E.g. Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 135; Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie* (1906), 1464; Ziegler, *Plutarchos* (1951), 922. Drachmann, *Atheism* (1922), 31, even believed that Diagoras was 'on the boundary line between the Ionian philosophy and the Sophistic'. Although Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 44 n. 196, said that Drachmann overestimated Diagoras, he himself argued (p. 25 ll. 13–21) that to some extent Diagoras should be considered a philosopher, because in antiquity theology was a part of philosophy. He was inclined to consider Diagoras not as a professional philosopher, but as an amateur one who 'from whatever impulse and under whatever influences, ventured to write on philosophical subject ... his book – which then we might call a pamphlet – may well have been a passionate outcry rather than a cool discussion of a problem' (p. 31 ll. 9–15).

120 Lana, *Studi* (1973), 67 n. 16, rightly, considered these testimonies to be 'generiche e chiaramente autoschediastiche'.

only the information that Diagoras was a poet. Above, I have tried to show that the anecdotes about the poet's change of faith and supposed study of philosophy were invented no earlier than in the Hellenistic period to explain that the same person was the author of both pious poems and an atheistic book (see chap. IV 3).

The authenticity of Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι is certainly not supported by the fact there were other impious people (e.g. Cinesias) to whom the book could be attributed. It seems to me that the anonymous author deliberately chose to use Diagoras' name, because he was the most well-known atheist. After his escape from Athens, where he was to be tried for impiety, a high reward was offered for his murder or capture and this decree was inscribed on a bronze stele. Therefore, quite understandably, it would have been very hard to find a better candidate for the authorship of an atheistic book.

It seems probable to me that a sophist used the name of Diagoras to publish his atheistic work in the first half of the 4th century BC.[121] The question of the existence of gods as well as the origins of religion were then as valid as in the second half of the 5th century, as is testified in book X of Plato's Νόμοι. There Plato argues against the views of atheists and presents new evidence for the existence of gods (see chap. IV 2).

B. Φρύγιοι λόγοι

For a long time scholars believed the work Φρύγιοι λόγοι attacked the mysteries of the Phrygian goddess Cybele.[122] William Worth even ingeniously tried to show that the title Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι seems to prove such an interpretation. He recalled that the ancients often gave Cybele the nickname πυργοφόρος, because she was presented with a crown of towers on her head.[123] It was not until F. Jacoby

121 Already Wehrli, *op. cit*., 126 assumed: 'daß ihm (scil. Diagoras) in nicht näher bestimmbarer Zeit die anonyme Schrift eines sophistischen Atheisten zugelegt wurde.'

122 Thus already Vossius, *De historicis Graecis* (1650), 437 'Phrygios sermones fuisse arbitror historiam eorum, quae ad Cybelen sive matrem Phrygiam et eius sacra pertineret; atque ab eo esse fine hoc conscriptum, ut a sacris illius homines averteret.' See Wellmann, *Diagoras* (1903), 311 'Sie (scil. die Schrift Φρύγιοι λόγοι) wird durch Verspottung phrygischer Kulte mit Anspielung auf athenische Verhältnisse die alten Götter zu stürzen unternommen haben.' Cf. Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 494.

123 Worth, Τατιανοῦ Πρὸς Ἕλληνας (1700), 96 'Nempe Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι ipsi hi libri erant, quos scripsit de sacris Cybeles, quam turritam seu in capite turrim gestantem repraesentabant veteres.' Similarly Derenne, *op. cit*., 61 and Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 180, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 80. Cybele as πυργοφόρος: *Anth. Pal.* V 260, 2 Ῥείης πυργοφόρου. Also see Varro, *Ant.*

that a serious attempt was made to explain the meaning of the Φρύγιοι λόγοι, but he also did not study the so-called 'Phrygian literature' in detail, only admitting that various versions and other titles could exist.[124] What is more, he did not take into account all the other scholarly works on the subject. In his opinion, the Φρύγιοι λόγοι and other similar books attempted to present in an interesting way what the Greek mysteries had taken from the secret wisdom of the East, which was found in ancient tombs and on steles. Jacoby cited an interesting passage from an extant fragment of Plutarch's work *De Daedalis Plataeensibus*.[125] It states that some Greeks saw in Orphic, Egyptian and Phrygian *logoi* a secret philosophy hidden in myths and symbols. But there were also those who considered such works to be impious.[126]

I shall now try to determine when the so-called 'Phrygian literature' first emerged and what kinds of books it included. To Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι, we may add the Φρύγιος λόγος by Democritus of Abdera,[127] *Phrygiae litterae* of the Egyptian Heracles,[128] and the no doubt identical Φρύγια γράμματα, about which Plutarch writes in his treatise *De Iside et Osiride*,[129] as well as Thymoites' Φρυγία ποίησις (Diod. III 67, 5). Without stating the author's name, Φρύγιοι λόγοι are mentioned by Lysimachus of Alexandria (c. 200 BC),[130] Plutarch (see n. 125) and the Neoplatonist Damascius (5th/6th century).[131] Moreover, Plutarch mentions an anonymous Φρύγιος λόγος in his dialogue *De defectu oraculorum* 10, 415 A (T 93).

---

rer. div. fr. 267 Cardauns ap. Aug. *Civ. Dei* VII 24 'turres in capite'; Lucret. II 606 'muralique caput summum cinxere corona'; Propert. III 17, 35 "vertice turrigero'; Verg. *Aen*. VI 784–785 'Berecyntia mater ... turrita'; Ovid. Fasti IV 219; Ovid. Metam. X 696 'turritaque Mater'. It is worth adding that Lénormant, *Sur les représentations* (1861), 405–410 as well as Bratke, *Die Stellung des Clemens* (1887), 657–659 assumed that Clement of Alexandria acquired his information on pagan mysteries from Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι. This view has rightly been rejected by Gabrielson, *Über die Quellen des Clemens* (1906), 38 and Hontoir, *Comment Clément* (1905), 185–188.

124 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 28 ll. 33 – 29 ll. 27, 46 n. 231. Also see Woodbury, *op. cit*., 201–203; Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1980), 58–65; Rives, *Phrygian Tales* (2005), 223–244.

125 Plut. *De Daedal. Plat*. fr. 157 Sandbach ap. Eus. *Praep. ev*. III 1, 1 (T 94) = FGrHist 800 T 9 = Orphica T 671 Bernabé.

126 See Woodbury, *op. cit*., 202.

127 Democrit. DK 68 B 299 e ap. Diog. Laert. IX 48. See n. 163, below.

128 Cic. *Nat. deor*. III 42 = FGrHist 800 T 5 (T 98).

129 Plut. *De Is. et Os*. 29 p. 362 B = FGrHist 800 T 11 (T 97).

130 Lysimachus Alex. (FGrHist 382 F 8) ap. *Schol. Apoll. Rhod*. I 558 = FGrHist 800 T 12 (T 96) ὁ τοὺς Φρυγίους λόγους γράψας. See Gudeman, *Lysimachos* (1928), 32–39; Jacoby, FGrHist III b1 (1955), 165–167. See p. 93 below.

131 Damasc. *Dubit. et solut. de prim. princ*. 282 (II 154 Ruelle) = FGrHist 800 T 13 (T 95).

Already the grammarian Thrasyllus, living in the times of Emperor Tiberius, doubted the authenticity of Democritus' Φρύγιος λόγος and did not include it in a tetralogically ordered catalogue of that author's works.[132] This view has also been held by many scholars in modern times.[133] Whether or not someone believes Democritus was the author mainly depends on whether or not that person believes Democritus was under the influence of the wisdom of the East, which he may have encountered during his travels to Egypt, Ethiopia, Persia, Chaldaea and India.[134] We may add that many Greeks maintained that the Greek philosophy was dependent on 'barbarian' philosophy, i.e. that of the Egyptian and Chaldaean priests, Persian magi, Celtic druids, the gymnosophists and Jews.[135] The legend of Democritus' dependence on the spiritual wisdom of the East was most probably begun c. 200 BC by Bolus of Mendes (a city in the Nile Delta),[136] who published under the name of Democritus some of his own writings on the magical properties of animals, plants

132 Democrit. 68 A 33 ap. Diog. Laert. IX 45–49.

133 E.g. H. Diels in a commentary to DK 68 B 299 e; Hopfner, *Orient und die griechische Philosophie* (1925), 14; Steckel, *Demokritos* (1970), 197–200; Rives, *Phrygian Tales* (2005), 232–234; Leszl, *Democritus' Works* (2007), 56–57. Only a few, such as Eisler, *Zu Demokrits Wanderjahren* (1918), 198 accepted that the author of Φρύγιος λόγος was Democritus.

134 Antisthenes Rhodius (See n. 138); Demetrius Magnes fr. 29 Mejer ap. Diog. Laert. IX 35; Plin. *Nat. hist*. XXV 13 = DK 68 B 300, 6 = FGrHist 263 T 4; Plin. *Nat. hist*. XXX 9 = DK 68 B 300, 13 = FGrHist 263 F 2; Clem. Alex. *Strom*. I 15, 69, 4 = DK 68 B 299 = FGrHist 263 F 1; Ael. *Var. hist*. IV 20 = DK 68 A 16 = FGrHist 263 T 3c; Hippol. *Ref. omn. haer*. I 13, 1 = FGrHist 263 T 3d; Suda s.v. Δημόκριτος (II 44 Adler) = FGrHist 263 T 3b. Scholars who consider these journeys to be fictitious are listed in n. 133 Similarly, Steckel, *Demokritos* (1970), 199. However, some scholars do not rule out the possibility that Democritus could have travelled to some of these places. See Schirren, Rechenauer, *Biographie* (2013), 214 'und so wird man den Nachrichten von Reisen … mit Vorbehalten begnügen müssen'; Rechenauer, *Leukipp und Demokrit* (2013), 840 'Immerhin könnten hier die Erkenntnisse, die Demokrit auf seinen ausgedehnten Reisen in den Orient gewonnen haben dürfte, ihren Niederschlag gefunden haben.' Capelle, *Älteste Spuren* (1925), 388–389 believed that Democritus could have travelled to Egypt and Babylon. On the probable influence of the Orient on Democritus, see Schmidt, *Demokrit und die östliche Welt (*1988), 218–244.

135 Diog. Laert. I 6–11. See, e.g., Festugière, *La Révélation* (1989), 19–44; Dihle, *Die Philosophie der Barbaren* (2000), 183–204; Burkert, *Die Griechen und der Orient* (2003), 55–78, 143–147; Dihle, *Hellas und der Orient* (2009), 35–38; Männlein-Robert, *Griechische Philosophen* (2009), 350–355. Cf. Fiedrowicz, *Christen und Heiden* (2004), 350–362, 723–725 ('Die Abhängigkeit griechischer Denker von den Schriften der Bibel').

136 On Bolos, see Bidez, Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (1938), I, 117–119, 170–173; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1948), 341–347; Waszink, *Bolos* (1954), 502–508; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I, 440–443; II, 636–645; Laurenti, *La questione Bolo-Democrito* (1985), 75–106; Festugière, *La Révélation* (1989), 197–200, 224–238; Letrouit, *Bolos* (1994), 133–134; Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy* (1995), 325–328, 335–341. Fragments in: DK 68 B 300.

and precious stones.[137] The tradition of Democritus' supposed travels to Oriental countries was not testified until Φιλοσόφων διαδοχαί by the historian Antisthenes of Rhodes (2nd century BC).[138] Therefore, it seems obvious that Φρύγιος λόγος was written in the Hellenistic period, no earlier than in the 3rd century. We should remember that also in the Hellenistic period it was claimed that Democritus had written works, such as Χαλδαικὸς λόγος, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἱερῶν γραμμάτων and Περὶ τῶν ἐν Μερόῃ (scil. ἱερῶν γραμμάτων suppl. Froben). Franz Susemihl (1826–1901) tried to explain why these four works were ascribed to Democritus.[139] He drew attention to the fact that Democritus was supposed to have relied on three oriental sages: the Chaldaean Ahikar,[140] Apollobeches of Coptus in Upper Egypt,[141] and Dardanus.[142] According to F. Susemihl, the works Χαλδαικὸς λόγος and Περὶ τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἱερῶν γραμμάτων passed on the learning of Ahikar, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Μερόῃ that of Apollobeches, and Φρύγιος λόγος that of Dardanus. Although F. Susemihl was somewhat hesitant to connect Φρύγιος λόγος with Dardanus, this hypothesis seems quite plausible,[143] because Dardanus was considered the founder

137 Thus, e.g., Hammer-Jensen, *Pseudo-Demokrit* (1924), 222; Guthrie, *A History* (1965), II, 388 n. 1. See Colum. VII 5, 17 (DK 68 B 300, 3) 'sed Aegyptiacae gentis auctor memorabilis Bolus Mendesius, cuius commenta, quae appellantur graece Χειρόκμητα, sub nomine Democriti falso produntur …' Some scholars, nevertheless, rightly argue that not all the *Psudodemocritea* should be ascribed to Bolos: Kroll, *Bolos und Demokritos* (1934), 228–232; Bidez, Cumont, *op. cit*., I, 118; Jacoby, *FGrHist III a* (1943), 25; Schmid, *op. cit*., 346; Waszink, *op. cit*., 502–503, 506.

138 Antisthenes Rhodius (FGrHist 508 F 12 = fr. 12 Giannattasio Andria) ap. Diog. Laert. IX 35. Other testimonies on the journeys of Democritus in n. 134.

139 Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 483 n. 132, 484 n. 137.

140 Democrit. DK 68 B 299 = FGrHist 263 F 1 ap. Clem. Alex. *Strom*. I 15, 69, 4 λέγεται γὰρ τὴν Ἀκικάρου στήλην ἑρμηνευθεῖσαν τοῖς ἰδίοις συντάξαι συγγράμμασι. Teophrastus was supposed to have written a dialogue Ἀκίχαρος (fr. 1 = fr. 727 No. 13 Fortenbaugh et al. ap. Diog. Laert. V 50). A commentary to DK 68 B 299 (II 208) includes the suggestion that the Theophrastus dialogue could have contributed to the story of Democritus translating the Ahikar stele. In my opinion, however, this view seems debatable. On knowledge of Ahikar's work in Greece, see: Wellmann, *Zu Demokrit* (1926), 474–475; Schmidt, *Demokrit* (1988), 220–221, 238–239; Wilsdorf, *Der weise Achikaros* (1991), 191–206; Luzzatto, *Grecia e Vicino Oriente* (1992), 5–84; Fales, *Storia di Ahiqar* (1993), 143–166; Luzzatto, *Ancora sulla 'Storia di Ahiqar'* (1994), 253–275.

141 See Bidez, Cumont, *Les mages* (1938), II 13 n. 19, 15 n. 3, 309 n. 3; Preisendanz, *Pibechis* (1941), 1311 l. 43–1312 l. 48. Cf. PGM II 66.

142 Democrit. 68 B 300, 13 = FGrHist 263 F 2 ap. Plin. *Nat. hist*. XXX 9 'Democritus Apollobechem Coptitem et Dardanum e Phoenice inlustravit, voluminibus Dardani in sepulchrum eius petitis, suis vero ex disciplina eorum editis.' The problems of the textual criticism and interpretation of this fragment are discussed by Wünsch, *Der Zauberer Dardanus* (1911), 319–320; Jacoby, *FGrHist III a* (1943), 28–29; Speyer, *Bücherfunde* (1970), 72–73.

143 Similarly Jacoby, *FGrHist III a* (1943), 28 (commentary to 263 F 2).

of the mysteries of the Phrygian Mother goddess[144] as well as the progenitor of the Trojans, who were quite frequently called Phrygians.[145] Therefore, it seems perfectly understandable that Φρύγιος λόγος, which was probably written in the 3rd century BC, should also be included among the works of Democritus. Nevertheless, one has to concede that there is another tradition, according to which Dardanus was a Jewish sage whose wisdom was only second to that of Solomon.[146] Later, he was considered to be an outstanding magician and author of books on magic who was usually mentioned alongside people, such as Apollobex/Apollobeches, Zoroaster and Ostanes.[147] That is why we cannot rule out that Pliny the Elder (see n. 142) had in mind the magician Dardanus.

Some scholars have assumed that the Φρύγια γράμματα (= *Phrygiae litterae*) of the Egyptian Heracles were written at time when Ptolemy started identifying Isis as the Phrygian Mother goddess.[148] The Cybele cult was already written about by the adviser of Ptolemy I Soter (306–283), Eumolpid Timotheos (Arnob. *Adv. nat*. V 5), who most probably organised the Phrygian cult in Ptolemaic Egypt.[149]

---

144 Clem. Alex. *Protr*. II 13, 3; Arnob. *Adv. nat*. II 73.

145 Thus Wellmann, *Dardanos* (1901), 2180; von Geisau, *Dardanos* (1964), 1389. Cf. Caduff, *Antike Sintflutsagen* (1986), 133–142. Although Homer distinguished between Phrygians and Trojans, later writers considered them to be the same people. E.g. Aeschylus, *Φρύγες ἢ Ἕκτορος λύτρα* fr. 263–272 Radt (TrGF III 366–370); Aesch. fr. 446 (TrGF III 456); Sophocles fr. 366 Radt (TrGF IV 328); Eur. *Hec*. 4. 492; *Hel*. 369; *Iph. Aul*. 1053; *Orest*. 1381; Aristoph. fr. 696 Kassel-Austin (PCG III 2, 357–358); Aristonicus, *Περὶ σημείων Iliados ad Il*. II 862 p. 79–80 Friedlaender; Serv. *Comm. Verg. Aen*. I 182 (I 73 Thilo); *Schol. A Hom. Il*. II 862 (I 348–349 Erbse); *Schol. Eur. Hec*. 4 (I 12 Schwartz); *Schol. Apol. Rhod*. I 936–49f p. 81–82 Wendel; Eustath. *Comm. Hom. Il*. II 862 (I 574 van der Valk). See Hall, *When Did the Trojans* (1988), 15–18; *eadem*, *Inventing the Barbarian* (1989), 38–39.

146 Ios. *Ant. Iud*. VIII 43, which is based on the Old Testament *Book of Kings* (3 *Reg*. 5, 11 Δάρδα; 1 *Reg*. 5, 11 Hebrew version).

147 Colum. X 358 'Dardanicae artes'; Apul. *Apol*. 90; Tert. *De anima* 57; Arnob. *Adv. nat*. I 52; PGM I 126 ξίφος Δαρδάνου. See Kroll, *Dardanos* (1935), 25–26; Hermann, *Dardanos* (1957), 593–594; Scheer, *Dardanos* (1997), 319–320.

148 Thus Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 164–165; Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie* (1906), II, 1546 n. 5. On syncretism in the Cybele cult, see Schwenn, *Kybele* (1922), 2279 ff. (e.g. Cybele priests were simultaneously Isis priests); Otto, Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte* (1938), 77 ff.; Nock, *review of Otto, Bengtson* (1942), reprint in: *idem*, *Essays* (1972), 554–558; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I, 244, 277–279. Colin, *L'Isis* (1994), 271–294 tried to show that the syncretism of Isis and Cybele did not play a significant role in Egypt, p. 293 'Il s'agissait là d'un syncrétisme artificiel né d'une élaboration savante. Dans la réalité concrète du culte quotidien de la déesse, en Égypte, sa portée dut être limitée.'

149 Gruppe, *op. cit*., 1546; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 129; Schwenn, *op. cit*., 2226; Weinreich, *Timotheos* (1937), 1342; Otto, Bengtson, *op. cit*., 79–80; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1974), 95. Differently Fraser, *op. cit*., I, 279 'does not seem very likely'.

The first extant traces of the Phrygian cult in Egypt date back to the rule of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246).[150] The Φρύγια γράμματα could therefore have been written at time when Timotheos was active and interest in the Cybele mysteries increased,[151] but there are no grounds to consider him to be the author of this work. Some scholars, however, are of the opinion that the Φρύγια γράμματα were not written until the 2nd century BC.[152] A similar conclusion was made by Wilhelm Michaelis, who tried to prove that *Index deorum cognominum*, which Cicero referred to when writing *Phrygiae litterae*,[153] was the work of a Peripatetic, living on Rhodes in the 2nd century BC.[154] Scholars, however, do not agree as to which deity is concealed in the term the Egyptian Heracles. Richard Reitzenstein (1861–1931) believed this was the god Khnuphis of Herakleopolis,[155] whereas Theodor Hopfner (1886–1946) thought it was the Egyptian god of air, Shu.[156] On the other hand, we should note that Arthur Darby Nock (1902–1963) proposed a quite different interpretation of the Φρύγια γράμματα. In his opinion, this was an euhemeristic work, discussing the ancient question of whether the cradle of culture was Egypt or Phrygia.[157] Herodotus (II 2) writes that the pharaoh Psam-

150 Jouget, BCH 20, 1896, 398–399 (inscription edition); Otto-Bengtson, *op. cit*., 78–79; Fraser, *op. cit*., 277.

151 Thus Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 47 n. 231.

152 Parmentier, *Recherches* (1920), 18; Otto, Bengtson, *op. cit*., 85; Griffiths, *Plutarch, De Iside* (1970), 403.

153 Cic. *Nat. deor*. III 42 (T 98) 'alter (scil. Hercules) traditur Nilo natus Aegyptius, quem aiunt Phrygias litteras conscripsisse.'

154 Michaelis, *De origine* (1898), 59–68. His hypothesis was accepted by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 164 and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 420. Nevertheless, we should note that according to Bobeth, *De indicibus* (1904), 57 the archetype of the *Index deorum cognominum* emerged no earlier than in the 1st century BC. This view was accepted by Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 392 and Heitsch, *Die Entdeckung der Homonymie* (1972), 8 n. 2. On the *Index deorum cognominum* in Cic. *Nat. deor*. III 53–60, see Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 142–144.

155 Reitzenstein, *op. cit*., 165. Similarly, Eisler, *Zu Demokrits Wanderjahren* (1918), 198. Also see Gruppe, *Herakles* (1918), 986–987.

156 Hopfner, *Plutarch über Isis und Osiris* (1941), 134; Griffiths, *The Orders of Gods* (1955), 23 (identification of Heracles with Khonsu, Khnum and Shu); Lloyd, *Herodotus* (1976), 194–195, 202 assumed that Herodotus identified Heracles either as the god Khonsu (II 42, 3), or the god Shu (II 43). In his opinion, there was no contradiction here, since Khonsu 'assumed certain characteristics of Shu, the Air-god who was imagined to support the sky, a function paralleled by the legend of Herakles and Atlas' (p. 195). Also see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* (2000), 142 (s.v. Chons) [identification of Khonsu with Heracles], 688–689 (s.v. Schu) [identification of Khonsu with Shu].

157 Nock, *review of Otto, Bengtson* (1942), 221 n. 28, reprint in: *idem*, *Essays on Religion* (1972), II, 556 n. 28 assumed that the Φρύγια γράμματα was 'a learned Euhemerizing work, bearing on the

metichus I (664–610) conducted an interesting experiment to resolve the issue. It turned out that the Phrygian language was older, because the first word that children raised in isolation uttered was *bekos*, which in Phrygian means bread.[158]

In his *Libyan Stories*, Dionysius Scytobrachion (3rd century BC)[159] refers to the Φρυγία ποίησις by Thymoites,[160] who was supposed to have lived in the times of Orpheus. On one of his many travels, he reached Nysa, where he heard many interesting stories about the deeds of Dionysus. These stories he decided to write down for posterity. The lack of an Egyptian theme in this work is immediately striking. Φρυγία ποίησις has a completely different character to the Φρύγια γράμματα.[161] In the former work there is most probably no reference to the Phrygian goddess Cybele, and perhaps the title is such because the supposed author was the Trojan Thymoites, the grandson of Laomedon, the king of Troy.[162] I have already mentioned (n. 145) that ancient authors often regarded Trojans to be Phrygians.

However, it is hard to say anything in detail about the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι referred to by Lysimachus of Alexandria, Plutarch and the Neoplatonist Damascius (see above). Since our knowledge of the Phrygian literature is so modest, it is probably impossible to determine to what extent the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι was related to the Φρύγια γράμματα or to the Φρύγιοι λόγοι ascribed to Diago-

---

old problem (Her. II 2) of the claims of Egypt and Phrygia for priority in culture.' Moreover, Nock, *review of Bidez, Cumont* (1940), 196, reprint in: *idem*, *Essays*, p. 523 believed that 'the *Phrygia grammata* do not seem to have emanated from Phrygia'. We should add that there also existed Φρύγιοι λόγοι, which discussed Phrygian history and myths. See Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 369 with note c. Ael. *Nat. anim.* II 21 λέγουσι δὲ Φρύγιοι λόγοι καὶ ἐν Φρυγίᾳ γίνεσθαι δράκοντας. Ael. *Var. hist.* XII 45 Φρύγιοι καὶ ταῦτα ᾄδουσι λόγοι· Μίδου τοῦ Φρυγὸς ἔτι νηπίου καθεύδοντος μύρμηκας εἰσέρπειν εἰς τὸ στόμα καὶ πάνυ φιλοπόνως καὶ φιλέργως εἰσφέρειν τοὺς πυρούς.

158 See Lloyd, *Herodotus* (1976), 4–12; Sułek, *The Experiment of Psammetichus* (1989), 645–651;Vannicelli, *L'esperimento linguistico* (1997), 201–217; Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech* (2003), 68–111.

159 Until recently it was believed that Dionysius lived in the 2nd century BC. Thus, for instance, Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1923), 509 (2nd half of 2nd century); Gärtner, *Dionysios* (1967), 69. However, Rusten, *Dionysius* (1982), 19–29, showed that in *PHibeh* 186 there are fragments of the Argonauts myth taken from a work by Dionysius. Turner, *The Hibeh Papyri* (1955), II, 53–55, dated the papyrus to c. 250–220, and Rusten, *op. cit.*, 28, to c. 200 BC. That is why Rusten, *op. cit.*, 89–90, believed Dionysius lived from c. 270 (in the *Libyan Tales* there is an allusion to the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult) to c. 220. On the *Libyan Tales*, see Rusten, *op. cit.*, 102–112; Rives, *Phrygian Tales* (2005), 224–225; Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 125–128.

160 Dionysius Scytobrachion fr. 8 Rusten ap. Diod. III 67, 5.

161 See Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen* (1901), 95 n. 2.

162 It seems valid to wonder whether Φρυγία ποίησις was the actual title of the work or just a description of it.

ras. Any attempts to try and identify these works are doomed to failure, since no eventual hypothesis can be convincingly justified.[163] Nevertheless, I am almost certain that the Φρύγιος λόγος of Democritus, the Φρυγία ποίησις of Thymoites and the Φρύγια γράμματα of the Egyptian Heracles are different works. That is why Italo Lana was wrong to include in his edition of testimonies of Diagoras (T 35–38) texts on the Φρύγια γράμματα = *Phrygiae litterae* and on the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι. Although we may debate whether or not the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι are identical to Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι, I. Lana did not actually examine the problem and instead based his opinion solely on the external similarity of the titles. Likewise, Hermann Diels (1848–1922) and Walther Kranz (1884–1960) were wrong when in their commentary to fragment 68 B 299 e they referred the reader to Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι, the Φρύγια γράμματα and the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι. This suggests the erroneous view that the same anonymous work could be ascribed either to Democritus or to Diagoras.[164]

Above I have tried to show that Democritus' Φρύγιος λόγος and the Φρύγια γράμματα = *Phrygiae litterae* were most probably written in the 3rd century BC. Also originating from that century was the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι referred to by Lysimachus of Alexandria in his discussion of the genealogy of the mother of Achilles (see n. 130). Lysimachus lived around the 200 BC period, and the way in which he cites this book indicates that it was not entirely new. Therefore it must have been written in the 3rd century BC, perhaps even in the first half of that century.[165]

From the above arguments one may conclude Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι was an apocryphal work written in the Hellenistic period. It also seems doubtful that the book was a criticism of the Cybele mysteries. I have already mentioned that according to F. Jacoby and L. Woodbury, books such as Φρύγιοι λόγοι, Ὀρφικοὶ

163 Eisler, *Zu Demokrits Wanderjahren* (1918), 198 with n. 18a and 18b identified the Φρύγια γράμματα as the anonymous Φρύγιοι λόγοι, but believed it had nothing to do with Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι and Democritus' Φρύγιος λόγος. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 371, was of the opinion that ὁ τοὺς Φρυγίους λόγους γράψας (See n. 130) referred to Diagoras. This view was already rejected by Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), 509 n. 1. On the other hand, Rives, *Phrygian Tales* (2005), 236 n. 37, maintains that 'The anonymous *Phrygian logoi* cited by Lysimachus might plausibly have also concerned Troy.'

164 This erroneous view was held by Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 200, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 99 and Woodbury, *op. cit.*, 201 'It seems possible that the title Φρύγιοι λόγοι was transferred from Democritus to Diagoras, because of an imagined association between them.' H. Diels and W. Kranz, however, were right in their commentary to 68 B 299e (II 210) to state that 'das nähere verhältnis der Pseudo-demokritischen Schrift zu den Pseudodiagorischen Φρύγιοι λόγοι ist nicht auszumachen.'

165 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 46 n. 231. On dating Lysimachus, see Gudeman, *Lysimachos* (1928), 33–34.

λόγοι and Αἰγυπτιακοὶ λόγοι presented in an attractive way the secret wisdom of the East concealed in various myths and symbols and also what elements of this wisdom were adopted in the Greek mysteries. They also maintained that some ancient Greeks considered such books to be impious. That is why the two scholars considered it possible to ascribe the anonymous and 'impious' Φρύγιοι λόγοι to Diagoras, who was a notorious atheist. F. Jacoby did not rule out this possibility,[166] but actually opted for a different explanation. He believed that the Φρύγιοι λόγοι referred to by Tatian in his apology *Oratio ad Graecos* 27 (cited in n. 86) is not the title of the book, but its description. Diagoras' work was actually 'Phrygian writing', from the point of view of a Christian author who condemned pagan theology and especially the esoteric doctrines which were uncomfortably close to the Christian doctrine of salvation.[167] Although this interpretation is very interesting, it does not seem very convincing. F. Jacoby failed to take into account the fact that Tatian in his defence of Christians against the charge of atheism referred to three impious books written by pagans: Diagoras' Φρύγιοι λόγοι, Ὑπομνήματα by Leon of Pella and a work by Apion of Alexandria (1st century AD) on Egyptian gods (probably the same work as Αἰγυπτιακά).[168] The apology therefore explicitly referred to works which Tatian considered to be impious. Moreover, Diagoras' book was referred to by the Arab writer Al-Mubaššir[169] (T 10). Although F. Jacoby predicted this counterargument and did try to pre-empt it, the reasoning he used does not seem very convincing. He maintained that the Neoplatonist Porphyry, who was the indirect source of Al-Mubaššir, knew Christian literature well because he was the author of the work Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν. By this he may have wanted to say that Porphyry could have acquired the information on the Φρύγιοι λόγοι from the work by Tatian. I, however, doubt the reliance of the Neoplatonist on the Christian apologist can ever be proved. Moreover, Jacoby had himself earlier stated (see chap. III 1) that in writing his lives of the philosophers Porphyry referred to a compilation called Βίοι φιλοσόφων.

---

166 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 29 ll. 18–22. Tatian could have attributed the Φρύγιοι λόγοι to Diagoras, because they treated the mysteries in the same way as the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι, though in a quite different spirit. According to Jacoby, such a mistake was quite understandable since Tatian considered Diagoras to be an Athenian.

167 Jacoby, *op. cit*., 29 ll. 22–27.

168 Tat. *Or. ad Gr*. 27 (T 68) Λέοντος κεκτημένοι τὰ ὑπομνήματα (FGrHist 659 T 1) πρὸς τοὺς ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐλέγχους δυσχεραίνετε· καὶ τὰς περὶ τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον θεῶν δόξας Ἀπίωνος (FGrHist 616 F 18) ἔχοντες παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ὡς ἀθεωτάτους ἡμᾶς ἐκκηρύσσετε.

169 Al-Mubaššir (T 10) 'After his death, a book was found next him written in the language of the inhabitants of Phrygia and full of mockery of divine matters.' See chap. II 8 A and my commentary to Diag. T 10.

L. Woodbury[170] maintained that circles hostile to the secret wisdom of the East tried to show that oriental teachings were the cause of atheism among some Greek philosophers (e.g. Democritus and Protagoras). He believed that in this way these circles tried 'to fit all Greek atheists into a single category and to find for the category a single explanation.' He even put forward a very daring hypothesis that there existed a Phrygian school of atheists (p. 202, n. 64), to which belonged people 'seduced by the false wisdom of the east' (p. 202).

This hypothesis, however, is based on very tenuous arguments and therefore, in my opinion, can be easily disproved. Among those Aelian mentions in his catalogue of atheists (*Var. hist*. II 31 = T 60) is Diogenes the Phrygian, whom Woodbury saw as Diogenes of the Phrygian school of atheists. This is why he rejected the hypothesis of H. Diels, who tried to show that this was Diogenes of Apollonia (DK 64 A 3).[171] Although one may have certain reservations with regard to Diels's interpretation, it is at least partly based on ancient testimonies, whereas Woodbury's hypothesis is based on pure speculation.

Among those supposedly seduced by the impious and false wisdom of the east were Democritus and Protagoras, educated by Persian magi who had been left in Abdera by king Xerxes. Yet the example of Democritus does not support Woodbury's theory, because that particular philosopher was not considered an atheist and was not included in the catalogue of atheists.[172] Woodbury's hypothesis is based on only one ancient testimony, that of Philostratus, who in his Βίοι σοφιστῶν written in 238 AD recounted the history of Persians teaching Protagoras to explain his scepticism with regard to the existence to the gods, i.e. his 'atheism'.[173] This information probably comes from the work Περσικά by the his-

170 Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 202.

171 H. Diels's hypothesis was accepted by many historians of philosophy, e.g., Zeller, Nestle, *Die Philosophie* (1923), I 1, 338 n. 1; Guthrie, *A History* (1965), II, 363; Kirk, Raven, Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1983), 434. *Forschungsbericht* in Winiarczyk, *Starożytne wykazy* (1977), 62–66.

172 Democritus as a student of magi: DK 68 A 1 = FGrHist 263 T 2 ap. Diog. Laert. IX 34. Only one late testimony (NB not referred to by Woodbury) suggests that some uneducated people could consider Democritus to be an impious person. Apuleius of Madaura (2nd century AD) writes as follows (*Apol*. 27) 'verum haec ferme communi quodam errore imperitorum philosophis obiectantur, ut partim eorum qui corporum causas meras et simplicis rimantur irreligiosos putent eoque aiant deos abnuere, ut Anaxagoram et Leucippum et Democritum et Epicurum ceterosque rerum naturae patronos.' Also see Cic. *Nat. deor*. I 29; II 76.

173 Philostratus, *Vit. soph*. I 10 (II 13 Kayser) = DK 80 A 2. Abdera remained under Persian rule in the years c. 512–476 BC, which is why Kerferd, Flashar, *Die Sophistik* (1998), 28, believe that this information 'durchaus im Bereich des Möglichen liegt'.

torian Dinon of Colophon (4th century BC).[174] It is, nevertheless, too weak an argument to accept that the Φρύγιοι λόγοι were ascribed to Diagoras because he was considered to be an atheist of the Phrygian school.

I have tried to show that Jacoby and Woodbury have failed to explain why Diagoras was considered the author of Φρύγιοι λόγοι. I believe a more plausible solution to the problem may be proposed. In my opinion, the Φρύγιοι λόγοι contained euhemeristic interpretations.[175] It is generally known that for many pagans and Christians alike, euhemerism was an impious or indeed atheistic theory, which is why Euhemerus himself and some of his supporters were included in the catalogues of atheists.[176] So how could it be that an euhemeristic work was ascribed to Diagoras? It seems to me that during the Hellenistic period the work Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι, also ascribed to Diagoras, was already forgotten.[177] All people remembered was that Diagoras was the author of an atheistic book. In this situation it would not be particularly surprising if someone published a book expressing euhemeristic ideas under the name of the famous atheist Diagoras, because in many circles such literature was considered atheistic. This hypothesis may be supported by yet another argument. The Christian apologist Tatian[178] mentions alongside Φρύγιοι λόγοι, Leon's Ὑπομνήματα and Αἰγυπτιακά by Apion of Alexandria (1st century AD). Leon's work, written in the 3rd or 2nd century BC, included euhemeristic interpretations because he showed that Egyptian gods were humans who had undergone apotheosis. In antiquity this work was referred to in various ways (FGrHist 659) and

174 See Davison, *Protagoras, Democritus* (1953), 33–34; von Fritz, *Protagoras* (1957), 911; Kerferd, Flashar, *loc. cit*.

175 Already Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 370–371, assumed that Diagoras 'res gestas deorum sic, ut postea fecit Euhemerus, ad historiam revocasse.' Later Gomperz, *Griechische Denker* (1922), I, 482, considered Diagoras to be the precursor of euhemerism. These scholars were, however, wrong to consider the *Phrygioi logoi* an authentic work actually written by Diagoras in the 5th century BC. On the other hand, Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 133, rightly believed the *Phrygioi logoi* were an euhemeristic work attributed to Diagoras. Likewise, Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), 508 and Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 165, believed that works, such as the Φρύγιοι λόγοι and Φρύγια γράμματα contained euhemeristic ideas. See citation from Nock's work in n. 157.

176 On the attitude of pagans, Christians and Jews towards euhemerism, see, e.g., Schippers, *De ontwikkeling der euhemeristische godencritiek* (1952); Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 877–890; Vermander, *La polémique des Apologistes latins* (1982), 21–30 and Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 123–159 (here further literature). On the catalogues of atheists, see chap. IV 1 with n. 15–17. Testimonies of Euhemerus' atheism are presented by Winiarczyk, *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?* (1984), 171. On the ancient tradition presenting Euhemerus as an atheist philosopher, see Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 9–10.

177 A similar view was held by Jacoby, *op. cit*., 25 ll. 44–46.

178 Tat. *Or. ad Gr*. 27 (T 68). The Greek text in n. 86 and 168.

it was Friedrich Pfister (1883–1967) who first suggested that it was in the form of a letter sent from Alexander the Great to his mother Olympias, in which the king referred to the account of the Egyptian priest Leon.[179] A similar thought was probably also found in the work by Apion. That is why it seems probable that the work ascribed to Diagoras and cited by Tatian also contained euhemeristic ideas. This view is supported by the testimony of Arnobius (4th century AD), who mentions Diagoras among the supporters of Euhemerus alongside Leon of Pella and Nicagoras.[180] In my opinion, the testimonies of Tatian and Arnobius support the theory that the Φρύγιοι λόγοι belonged to euhemeristic literature. On the other hand, it is debatable as to whether or not ascribing the Φρύγιοι λόγοι to Diagoras was partly a

179 Pfister, *Ein Apokrypher Alexanderbrief* (1964), 291–297, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften* (1976), 104–111; Also see Cole, *Democritus* (1990), 153–163; Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 66–68, 131–132. Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 968–969 put forward the hypothesis that Leon lived towards the end of the 4th century BC, had a direct influence on Hecataeus of Abdera and an indirectly on Euhemerus. This view once had many supporters, but after Pfister's article, most scholars accepted that Leon's work was written later, in the 3rd or the 2nd century BC. We should add that the nickname *Pellaeus* only appears in Arnobius (*Adv. nat*. IV 29). According to the traditional point of view, which in my opinion is the most convincing, *Pellaeus* means *Aegyptius*. Leon of Pella would therefore be an Egyptian priest, whereas the author of the apocryphal letter remains unknown. See Winiarczyk, *op. cit*., 67 n. 259. However, Pfister, *loc. cit*., believed that this was not about Leon of Pella, but about the 'Lion of Pella', i.e. Alexander the Great. On the other hand, Rusten, *Pellaeus Leo* (1980), 197–201, considered the author of the apocryphal letter, indeed, to be called Leon, but one that came from Pella in Macedonia.

180 Arnob. *Adv. nat*. IV 29 (T 64) 'et possumus quidem hoc in loco omnis istos, nobis quos inducitis atque appellatis deos, homines fuisse monstrare vel Agragantino Euhemero replicato, cuius libellos Ennius, clarum ut fieret cunctis, sermonem in Italum transtulit, vel Nicagora Cyprio vel Pellaeo Leonte vel Cyrenensi Theodoro vel Hippone ac Diagora Meliis vel auctoribus aliis mille, qui scrupulosae diligentiae cura in lucem res abditas libertate ingenua protulerunt.' Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 38, believed Nicagoras was a supporter of euhemerism. Nevertheless, we have to admit that we know very little about this person. Some scholars have suggested to change the variant from 'Nicagora Melio' to 'Nicanore Melio', because Clement of Alexandria (*Protr*. II 24, 2 = T 63) gives a similar if not identical (without Leon) catalogue of atheists, which includes Nicanor of Cyprus. On the problem of identifying Nicagoras/Nicanor and the Arnobius source, see Winiarczyk, *The 'Sacred History'* (2013), 132–133. Nevertheless, we should concede that Theodorus and Hippo were not supporters of euhemerism. Although some scholars used to believe that Euhemerus was a student of Theodorus or belonged to the Cyrenaic school, the sources do not support this hypothesis and that is why it has been rightly rejected. See Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 92; *idem*, *The 'Sacred History"* (2013), 10 (here further literature). Hippo appears in Arnobius most probably because he was linked with Diagoras, and their names appear next each other in other catalogues of atheists. See chap. III 1, n. 7.

consequence of the anecdotal tradition in which Diagoras was the student of Democritus, the supposed author of the Φρύγιος λόγος.[181]

C. Conclusions

Up until now the prevalent view was that the titles Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι and Φρύγιοι λόγοι concerned the same work, which could be either authentic or apocryphal. Above I have tried to show that the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι is the work of a sophist in the first half of the 4th century, and that the Φρύγιοι λόγοι was written in the Hellenistic period. Someone might question this hypothesis, arguing that ancient tradition speaks only of one book. However, I believe that the work Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was already lost in the Hellenistic period. All that remained was the memory that Diagoras was the author of an atheistic book. That was the reason why Diagoras was considered to be the author of an euhemeristic work, which many pagans and Christians considered to be impious or even atheistic. Diagoras was still considered to be the author of one work, but the title of this work was now quite different. In the Roman Empire period, Tatian and Porphyry (on whom the Arab writer Al-Mubaššir partly relied) knew only about the Φρύγιοι λόγοι. The Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι is only mentioned by the *Suda*, whose author used a more ancient source mentioned by Hesychius of Miletus. I believe that Diagoras did not write an atheistic book. First the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι was attributed to Diagoras in the first half of the 4th century BC, and later in the Hellenistic period he was considered to be the author of the Φρύγιοι λόγοι.

5. Anecdotes presenting Diagoras' critical attitude towards religion

A. Throwing a statue of Heracles into the fire

We know three anecdotes which suggest that Diagoras was critically disposed towards the gods. The most famous one is of his casting a statue of Heracles into a fire.[182] The event has been cited by eleven authors. However, only seven attribute

181 The influence of the anecdotal tradition was accepted by Woodbury, *op. cit.*, 201 (but he was wrong to assume that Diagoras and Democritus were ascribed to the same work), on the other hand, Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 29 ll. 2–4 rejected this hypothesis.

182 Worth mentioning here is the known story of the failed attempt to burn the statue of another god (Callim. *Iamb.* 7, fr. 197 Pfeiffer = fr. 157 Asper; *Dieg. Callim. Iamb.* 7, 32 sq.). Fishermen of the

the deed to Diagoras.[183] Others say it was Euripides[184] or Diogenes of Sinope,[185] while the Arab author does not name the culprit at all.[186] An allusion to this anecdote is found in another work by John Tzetzes[187] and perhaps also in the works of Tertullian.[188]

Thracian city of Ainos fished out of the sea a statue of Hermes that had been carved by Epeius, the builder of the Trojan Horse. They first planned to burn it, but they were unable to chop it up into pieces. They were also unable burn it in one piece, and that is why they threw it back into the sea. But when the statue again got caught in their nets, they decided it was a god or something that belonged to a god. Therefore, on the shore they built for it a sanctuary (ἱερόν) and there they offered their first fruits in the form of fish. Following the instruction of the Oracle of Apollo, the statue was next moved to the city, where it was worshipped as Hermes Περφεραῖος. His image appears on coins minted in Ainos in the 5th century BC. See Burkert, *Homo Necans* (1983), 203; Graf, *Nordionische Kulte* (1985), 300–301. A statue of Sarapis, on the other hand, was successfully burned in Alexandria on 391 AD. The pagans were convinced that if someone touched the statue the world would descend into chaos and the heavens would collapse. A Christian soldier, however, chopped up the statue and cast it into a fire (Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* VI 23).

Merkelbach, *Weg mir dir, Herakles* (1991), 41–43, found an interesting analogy in the life of St. Phocas (*Vita* c. 3–7). As a ten-year-old boy he removed a statue of Heracles from a ship at Heraclea Pontica and commanded the demon that inhabited it to go to a fiery hell, with the words Ἄπελθε εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός (c. 7). Cf. Mt. 5, 22; 18, 9. Other examples of Christians destroying pagan statues are provided by Funke, *Götterbild* (1981), 808–813; Noethlichs, *Heidenverfolgung* (1986), 1162.

On the attitude towards the images of gods in antiquity, see: Clerc, *Les théories* (1915); Geffcken, *Der Bilderstreit* (1916/1919), 286–315, Borries, *Quid veteres philosophi* (1918); Hanson, *The Christian Attitude* (1980), 910–913; Funke, *Götterbild* (1981), 782–792; Cancik, Cancik-Lindemaier, The Truth of Images (2001), 43–61; Fiedrowicz, *Christen und Heiden* (2004), 411–420; Graf, *Plutarch und Götterbilder* (2005), 251–266; Wifstrand Schiebe, *Sinn und Wahrheitsgehalt der Kultbilder* (2006), 189–209.

183 Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 4 (T 27); Clem. Alex. *Protr.* II 24, 4 (T 63); Epiph. *Anc.* 103, 8 (T 28); Tzetzes, *Comment. Aristoph. Nub.* 829a (T 11); Tzetzes, *Chiliad.* XIII 374–384 (T 32); *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 830g (T 6 A); *Schol. Ael. Aristid.* ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 258 (T 31).

184 *Gnomol. Vat.* 276 (T 30); *Corp. Par.* 6, 48 (T 30).

185 *Theos. Tub.* 70 (T 29).

186 Ibn Durayd, *Kitāb al-Muğtanā* 67. See chap. II 8 B, where I discuss the hypothesis of F. Rosenthal, who ascribes the anecdote to Stratonicus.

187 Tzetzes, *Epist.* 104 (T 79). Here the thirteenth labour is mentioned.

188 Tert. *Apolog.* 14, 9 = *Ad nat.* I 10, 43 (T 88) 'Sed et Diogenes nescio quid in Herculem ludit'. Packmohr, *De Diogenis Sinopensis apophthegmatis* (1913), 21, saw here an allusion to the anecdote, but other scholars assume that Tertullian was referring to a tragedy by Diogenes: Weber, *De Dione Chrysostomo* (1887), 113, 149 ff.; Nauck, *TGF*² (1889 = 1964), 808; Natorp, *Diogenes* (1903), 769; Sayre, *Diogenes* (1938), 62; Braun, *Diogène* (1979), 226–227; Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 481–483. Winiarczyk, *Zur Frage der Autorschaft* (2005), 28–43, tried to show that Diogenes was not the author of the tragedies ascribed to him.

The anecdotes differ slightly from each other.[189] The action takes place either in Diagoras' house (T 28, 63), in a tavern (T 6 A, 11, 32), the temple of Heracles (T 29), or the house of a philosopher who had invited Diagoras for a feast (T 31). The name of the cooked dish varies: φακῆ (T 6 A, 29–32), φακός (T 11), ὄψον (T 28, 63) or γογγύλη (T 27). The circumstances also vary slightly. However, all the anecdotes state that Diagoras threw into the fire a wooden statue of Heracles (ξόανον [T 27, 30], ἄγαλμα [T 6 A, 31], τὸν Ἡρακλέα ξύλινον (T 28, 32), τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐκ ξύλου [T 29, 63], ξύλινον ἀνδριάντα [T 11])[190] to cook a meal and then mockingly told Heracles to perform his thirteenth labour. This apostrophe does not actually appear in T 27 and T 31, whereas the very concise version cited by Athenagoras (T 27) does not mention the thirteenth labour at all.[191]

Bruno Keil (1859–1916) tried to prove that this anecdote originated from a poem by Diagoras and tried to reconstruct a fragment of this poem on the basis of an anonymous 12th-century scholion to the speech of the rhetorician Aelius Aristides.[192] Most scholars rejected this hypothesis.[193] F. Jacoby, on the other hand, assumed that the story could have originated from an atheistic prose work if it expressed the weakness of graven images of wood and

189 The text of the anecdotes was analysed by Keil, *Ein neues Bruchstück* (1920), 63–67 (the article was published only after the author's death); Erbse, *Fragmente* (1941), 25–27.

190 The anecdotes include three different terms for the statue of the god: ξόανον, ἄγαλμα and ἀνδριάς. I agree with those scholars who say that the Greek terms do not always clearly state whether this is a cult statue or a votive statue. See Scheer, *Die Gottheit* (2000), 3–34, esp. 34; Steiner, *Images in Mind* (2001), 80–84, 104; Eich, *Gottesbild* (2011), 49. Also see Donohue, *The Greek Images* (1997), 31–45; Bettinetti, *La statua di culto* (2001), 27–42; Mylonopoulos, *Divine Images* (2010), 1–19.

191 Weinreich, *Triskaidekadische Studien* (1916), 82–83 noted that in antiquity people jokingly referred to other thirteenth labours of Heracles: 1) In one night Heracles deprived of virginity 50 daughters of Thestius, the king of Aetolia. See Clem. Alex. *Protr*. II 33, 4; Tat. *Or. ad Gr*. 21, 3; Paus. IX 27, 7; Arnob. *Adv. nat*. IV 26; Epiph. *Anc*. 106, 6 (I 129 Holl); *Anth. Pal*. XVI 92, 13–14; Tzetzes, *Chiliad*. II 36, 503 et 505. 2) Heracles believed he had to perform a thirteenth labour when the deceased emperor Claudius, whom he mistook for a terrible monster, arrived at the feast of the Olympian gods. See Sen. *Apocol*. 5 'putavit (scil. Hercules) sibi tertium decimum laborem venisse.'

192 Keil, *op. cit*., 65–67. The reconstructed fragment is on p. 67:

<πρὸς> δώδεκα τοῖσιν ἄθλοις

τρισκαιδέκατον τόνδ' ἐτέλεσ<σ>εν Ἡρακλῆς δῖος.

193 Only Ernst Diehl (1874–1947) included the 'new fragment' in his *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (1942), 157, whereas Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 205, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 104, included it in his edition of Diagoras fragments. Keil's hypothesis was rejected by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), 426 n. 4; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), 495; Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 38 n. 110, 44 n. 198, 45 n. 210. The authenticity of this fragment was also rejected by other editors of Diagoras' poetry: Page (1962), 383; Winiarczyk (1981), 29; Campbell (1992), 346.

stone,[194] but also this view cannot be considered convincing. Tanja S. Scheer does not rule out the possibility that the burning of the Heracles statue anecdote could have been the work of Christian apologists, who in this way wished to demonstrate the powerlessness of statues of pagan gods.[195] She argues that the anecdote did not appear until the 2nd century AD in the works of Athenagoras (T 27) and Clement of Alexandria (T 63), whereas it did not appear in the works of the pagan authors who wrote about Diagoras.[196] In my opinion, however, the view that the anecdote was invented in the Hellenistic period seems more probable, since two other anecdotes about Diagoras (see below) originate from this period.

The anecdote was twice associated with Euripides (T 30), but such mistakes quite frequently occur in gnomologies (see chap. II 6). B. Keil proposed a different explanation,[197] which I also find rather unconvincing. In his opinion, the term ὥσπερ Εὐρυσθεῖ,[198] which is first mentioned by Clement of Alexandria (T 63), and appears later in the *Theosophia Tubingensis* (T 29), led to attributing the anecdote to Euripides in *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (T 30).

It is worth remembering that we also know examples of the statues of Christian saints being burned in modern times. Philipp Frankfurter (1450–1511) wrote in verse *Die Geschichte des Pfarrers vom Kalenberg*, which includes a description of how the parson of Kalenberg threw into the fire the statues of the twelve apostles because he had nothing else to heat his room with. The *editio princeps* of this poem appeared in Augsburg in 1473.[199] Another story, concerning the life of the

194 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 26 ll. 46–49 'and even the story ... may derive from the book, if it entered into the wide-spread argument drawn from the apparent impotence of the "images of wood and stone".'

195 See criticism of pagan statues in the Bible: *Ps.* 115 (113 B), 4–7; *Ps.* 135 (134), 15–17; *Is.* 44, 9–20; *Jer.* 10, 3–15; *Bar.* 6 (= *Epist. Jer.*); *Dan.* 5, 23; 14, 1–22; *Habac.* 2, 18–19; *Sap.* 13, 10–14, 21; *Apoc.* 9, 20.

196 Scheer, *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild* (2000), 232–234.

197 Keil, *Ein neues Bruchstück* (1920), 64.

198 We should remember that Heracles carried out the twelve labours at the request of king Eurystheus.

199 Used here is the edition by Dollmayr, *Die Geschichte* (1906), vv. 1125–1136.

'Genad fraw, es ist hin zu kalt,
Ich muß einheitzen also balt
In den offen". Er nit enlie,
Eylendt er in die capellen gie,
Do er die zwelff potten fandt:
Er nam den ersten pey der handt:
„Wol auff mit mir, saum dich nit meer !
Der deinen hülffe ich begeer,

Swiss humanist Thomas Platter (1499–1582), was written by Henricus Valesius (Henri Valois) [1603–1676]. It appeared in print in *Miscellanea Tigurina* III 2, 1724, 251, which were published by Johann Jacob Huldricus (= Ulrich) [1683–1731]. A fragment from Platter's life speaks of him throwing into the fire a statue of St. John, which he had taken from a church in Zurich. It was reprinted by Johann Jakob Zimmermann (1695–1756) in the work *Epistola ad Nic. Nonnen qua Evemerus Messenius et Diagoras Melius ab atheismo contra Plutarchum aliosque defenduntur*, published in *Museum Historico-Philologico-Theologicum* I 4, 1729.[200]

B. Other anecdotes

The second anecdote speaks of how Diagoras was once on a ship during a violent storm. The other passengers wanted to throw him overboard, convinced that the presence of an atheist was provoking the anger of the gods against their ship. Diagoras then showed them other ships being tossed about by the waves and ironically asked whether on every other ship there was also another Diagoras.[201] The behaviour of Diagoras' fellow passengers was perfectly understandable, because for people in antiquity it was obvious that the gods punished impious people, and those who happened to be near an impious person could also suffer death. An equivalent example is found in the Old Testament, where sailors throw

---

Das du die stuben machest warm.
Wildt nit geen, ich trag dich am arm,
Und werstu noch so uppig stoltz,
Du must prinnen, ich hab kain holtz.'

200 Cited after: Zimmermann, *Opuscula* (1759), II 2, 1069 n. 'Auf einen Morgen, da Zwinglius vor Tag zum Frau-Mynster predigen solte, hatte Platter kein Holz und als man zur Kirchen gelaeutet, gedachte er du hast kein Holz und sind so viel Goezen in der Kirche; weil nun noch niemand zugegen war, gieng er in die Kirche zum naechsten Altar, erwischte einen Johannes, nimt ihn in die Schul, fahrt damit in den Ofen und spricht zu ihm: Jaegli buke dich, du must in den Ofen, ob du gleich Johannes seyn sollst; als er nun anfieng zu brennen, gab er wegen der Oelfarb grosse Blatern, da sagte Platter bey sich selbsten; Ryhrest du nicht, das du aber nit thun wirst, so will ich das Ofenthyrlin zuthun, du must nicht heraus, der Teufel trage dich dann heraus.'

201 Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 89 'idemque (scil. Diagoras), cum ei naviganti vectores adversa tempestate timidi et perterriti dicerent non iniuria sibi illud accidere qui illum in eandem navem recepissent, ostendit eis in eodem cursu multas alias laborantis quaesivitque num etiam in iis navibus Diagoram vehi crederent' (T 34); *Flor.* Ἄριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα 38 = *Corp. Par.* 6, 65 = *Flor. Monac.* 190 = *Flor. Leid.* 179 (T 35 A); *Gnomica Basil.* 156 = *Cod. Leid. Voss. 68* p. 29 adn. 2 Beynen (T 35 B).

the prophet Jonah into the sea after he admits that the storm had arisen because he was fleeing from the wrath of Yahweh.[202]

The third anecdote recalls Diagoras' stay on the island of Samothrace, where there was the famous sanctuary of the Cabeiri.[203] Someone showed him the votive offerings (ἀναθήματα) of people saved by the gods from violent storms, which was supposed to be evidence of divine providence. Diagoras then replied that there would be many more votive offerings if all those who had perished in sea disasters submitted them.[204] It should be added that according to Diogenes Laertius (VI 59), this anecdote was ascribed either to Diagoras or to Diogenes of Sinope.[205] One cannot rule out the possibility that Diagoras did indeed stay in Samothrace,[206] but this information could be fictitious because it probably emerged no earlier than in the Hellenistic period.

C. Why were Diagoras' words and deeds also attributed to Diogenes of Sinope?

Associating the same anecdote to two different people may be most easily explained by an accidental switching of names. That was how August Packmohr[207] tried to solve the problem. Although he was able to prove that the mixing up of names in relation to anecdotes did sometimes occur in gnomologies,[208]

202 See Appendix IV.

203 On the Cabeiri cult and sanctuary on the island of Samothrace, see Hemberg, *Die Kabiren* (1950); Cole, *Theoi Megaloi* (1984); Collini, *Gli dèi Cabiri* (1990), 237–287; Burkert, *Concordia Discors* (1993), 178–191; Vollkommer-Glökler, *Megaloi Theoi* (1997), 820–828; Graf, *Kabeiroi* (1999), 123–127; Mari, *Gli studi sul santuario* (2001), 155–167; Musti, *Aspetti della religione* (2001), 141–154; Clinton, *Stages of Initiation* (2003), 50–78, esp. 61 ff; Daumas, *Des Thèbes à Lemnos* (2005), 851–881; Dimitrova, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace* (2008).

204 Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 89 'at Diagoras cum Samothracam venisset Atheus ille qui dicitur, atque ei quidam amicus "tu, qui deos putas humana neglegere, none animadvertis ex tot tabulis pictis, quam multi votis vim tempestatis effugerint in portumque salvi pervenerint", "ita fit" inquit, "illi enim nusquam picti sunt qui naufragia fecerunt in marique perierunt"' (T 36); Diog. Laert. VI 59 = Arsenius, *Viol.* p. 201–202 Walz (T 37).

205 Diog. Laert. VI 59 = Diag. T 37 = Diog. V B 342 (SSR II 362).

206 Thus, e.g., Hemberg, *Die Kabiren* (1950), 68, 101 n. 3; van Straten, *Gifts for the Gods* (1981), 78.

207 Packmohr, *De Diogenis Sinopensis apophthegmatis* (1913), 21–23. Similarly Nestle, *Legenden vom Tod* (1936), 259, reprint in: *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (1948), 584. On the various reasons for mistakes in gnomologies, see chap. II 6.

208 Packmohr, *op. cit.*, 18 ff. I believe that this method could be used to try to explain why Diagoras was presented as the author of sayings that in other gnomologies are ascribed to other authors: *Flor. Monac.* 191–193 = *Flor. Leid.* 180–182 (T 80–82); Ioh. Georg. *Gnomol.* 297 Odorico = Gnom. Baroc. 191 (T 83).

Kurt von Fritz (1900–1985) rightly drew attention to the fact that this only concerned humorous remarks 'ohne ausgesprochene Tendenz oder Eigenart'.[209] The anecdotes ascribed to Diagoras and Diogenes, on the other hand, clearly have a pronounced character and trend, because the intention was to show that both these people were impious. I believe the anecdotes were deliberately ascribed to them in particular. It is worth adding that in the manuscript tradition there never appears a 'Diogenes' variant instead of a 'Diagoras' variant, while there do occur 'Protagoras' and 'Aristagoras' variants.

Several scholars chose a more sensible approach by trying to show that the switching of names in these anecdotes did not happen by chance. Already Carl Buresch (1862–1896)[210] believed that the author of the *Theosophia Tubingensis* 70 (T 29) really had Diogenes in mind. He stressed that the anecdote referred to φακῆ (a lentil dish), which in his opinion was the characteristic food of Cynics.[211] On the other hand, anecdotes concerning Diagoras mention the word γογγύλη (turnip)[212] or ὄψον (a cooked meal).[213] At first glance, Buresch's hypothesis seems convincing, but a detailed analysis of the anecdote text reveals its very serious weaknesses. Above all, Buresch failed to take into account that the words φακῆ and φακός (lentils) also appear in several other anecdotes, ones

209 Von Fritz, *Quellenuntersuchungen* (1926), 50.

210 Buresch, *Klaros* (1889), 119.

211 Although it is generally accepted that φακῆ was a typical Cynic dish, this argument is not that convincing since it was also the food of the poor (Aristoph. *Plut*. 1004 ἔπειτα πλουτῶν οὐκέθ' ἥδεται φακῆς; cf. Aristoph. *Equ*. 1007; *Vesp*. 811). It was also eaten by Cynics because it was the simplest and the cheapest food and simplicity was their ideal. See Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen* (1911), 214; Gossen, *Linse* (1956), 263–264 (already Solon fr. 38, 3 West and Hdt. IV 17, 1, mentioned φακός, and Epicharmus fr. 33 Kaibel ap. Athen. IV 47, 158 C mentions φακέα). Other food that Cynics ate included bread, onions, garlic and figs. On the diet of the Cynics, see Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909), 58, 111; *idem*, *Zur Legende* (1912), 400–403; Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1922), II 1, 318–319 n. 6. On the Cynic ideal of simplicity (εὐτέλεια, λιτῶς βιοῦν), see, e.g., Vischer, *Das einfache Leben* (1965), 75–83; Bees, *Zenons Politeia* (2011), 288–291. Attempts to defend Buresch's hypothesis were made by Goulet-Cazé, *Les premiers Cyniques* (1993), 146–147 n. 132; *eadem*, *Religion* (1996), 70–71 n. 133, by referring to several texts that speak of Cynics and their lentil dish: Crates V H 41 G. (SSR II 539–540) ap. *Gnom. Vat*. 384; Crates V H 72 G. (SSR II 552) ap. Plut. *De tuenda san. praec*. 7 p. 125 F; Athen. *Dipnosoph*. IV 44, 156 sqq. (including a description of a Cynic feast). In my opinion, however, the cited text do not support Buresch's hypothesis. They only confirm the well-known fact that Cynics liked to eat lentils, which was the food of the poor. Goulet-Cazé does not discuss the arguments put forward by Packmohr and Giannantoni (see n. 215).

212 Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr*. 4 (T 27).

213 Clem. Alex. *Protr*. II 24, 4 (T 63); Epiph. *Ancor*. 103, 8 (T 28).

which are associated with Diagoras.[214] I believe that this single fact disproves Buresch's theory.[215]

Hartmut Erbse (1915–2004) proposed a solution to the problem of authorship,[216] which I, nevertheless, also find rather unconvincing. He refers to a *scholion* to the speech by Aelius Aristides (T 31) which states that Diagoras was invited to a feast by a philosopher who cooked lentils. The meal suggests that the philosopher was a Cynic. This is why the anecdote of throwing a statue of Heracles into the fire was later associated with Diogenes. H. Erbse tried to support his hypothesis with yet another argument. He supported the opinion of B. Keil that the text in this scholion was the oldest version of the anecdote. As I have already written above (see n. 193), Keil's reconstruction of a fragment of Diagoras' poem was rejected by most scholars. There is therefore no evidence that the text of this scholion includes the oldest version of the anecdote.

In my opinion, before we answer the question as to why the anecdotes were linked both to Diagoras and Diogenes, we should first examine their contents. The story of casting a statue of Heracles into a fire signifies rejecting the cult of divine statues, whereas the words supposedly said during the storm at sea express lack of belief in divine providence. It is perfectly understandable why these two anecdotes were associated with Diagoras. Almost all ancient tradition presents him as a typical atheist, who apparently wrote an atheistic book and was featured in most of the catalogues of atheists (see above and Appendix I). Both anecdotes were to show his critical attitude towards belief in the gods.

We should next consider whether Diogenes could also be attributed with impious views? Ancient tradition states that although older Cynics did believe in the existence of a single deity, its presence in this world and the punishment of the impious in the other world, they decidedly rejected the anthropomorphic gods of the popular religion, the mysteries, prayers, the offering of sacrifices, divination and the sacredness of temples.[217] For the ardent worshippers of city-

214 *Schol. Aristoph. Nub*. 830 g (T 6 A); *Schol. Ael. Aristid. ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς* 258 (T 31); Tzetzes, *Comment. Aristoph. Nub*. 829a (T 11); Tzetzes, *Chiliad*. XIII 374–384 (T 32).

215 Buresch's hypothesis was already rejected by Packmohr, *op. cit*., 22, who pointed to the use of the word φακῆ in *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 830. Later, Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 482 n. 75, stated that the Cynic character of the anecdote is undermined by use of the word φακῆ in *Gnom. Vat*. 276, which ascribes the anecdote to Euripides.

216 Erbse, *Fragmente* (1941), 26–27.

217 On the Cynic religion, see, e.g., Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909), 79–83; Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1922), II 1, 328–331; Helm, *Kynismos* (1924), 12–13; Rudberg, *Zum Diogenes-Typus* (1936), 15–17; Babut, *La religion* (1974), 139–143; Malherbe, *Pseudo Heraclitus* (1978), 45–58; Kindstrand, *The Cynics* (1984), 172–175; Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 547–550; Goulet-Cazé, *Les premiers cyniques*

state gods, such an attitude towards popular religion was a sufficient reason to accuse Diogenes of atheism.[218] This is confirmed by Julian the Apostate, emperor of Rome in the years 361–363, who in a speech attacking uneducated Cynics, defended Diogenes against the accusation of atheism. He writes that a true Cynic worships god in his heart and that is why he did not have to participate in public cults.[219]

It is worth mentioning that Diogenes was similarly linked with an anecdote also associated with another well-known atheist in the ancient world, Theodorus of Cyrene.[220] In it both philosophers answer evasively to the charge of not believing in the gods.[221] This anecdote confirms my assumption that anecdotes about

(1993), 117–158; *eadem*, *Religion* (1996), 47–80. ; Desmond, *Cynics* (2008), 115-122. Other works in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 38–39. On the 'monotheism' of Antisthenes, see: Antisth. (V A 179 G. [SSR II 206] ap. Philod. *De piet*. (PHerc 1428 E c) 7a, 3–8, p. 72 Gomperz = p. 115 Schober [π]αρ' Ἀντισθένει δ' ἐν μὲν [τ]ῷ φυσικῷ λέγεται τὸ κατὰ νόμον εἶναι πολλοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ δὲ φύσιν ἕν[α]; Antisth. (V A 180 G. [SSR II 207]) ap. Cic. *Nat. deor*. I 32 'atque etiam Antisthenes in eo libro, qui physicus inscribitur, popularis deos multos, naturalem unum esse dicens tollit vim et naturam deorum', cf. Min. Fel. *Oct*. 19, 7; Lact. *Div. inst*. I 5, 18; Lact. *De ira* 11, 14. See Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 247–249; Brancacci, *La théologie d'Antisthène* (1985/86), 218–229. Criticism of the anthropomorphic presentation of gods: Antisth. (V A 181 G. [SSR II 207]) ap. Theodor. *Graec. affect. cur*. I 75 καὶ Ἀντισθένης [...] περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων βοᾷ· 'ἀπὸ εἰκόνος οὐ γνωρίζεται, ὀφθαλμῷ οὐχ ὁρᾶται, οὐδενὶ ἔοικε· διόπερ αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐκμαθεῖν ἐξ εἰκόνος δύναται.' cf. Clem. Alex. *Protr*. VI 71, 2; Clem. Alex. *Strom*. V 14, 108, 4; Eus. *Praep. ev*. XIII 13, 35. Criticism of the mysteries: Diog. (V B 339 G. [II 361]) ap. Diog. Laert. VI 39 et Plut. *De aud. poet*. 4, 21 EF. Criticism of certain types of prayer: Diog. (V B 350 G. [SSR II 364]) ap. Diog. Laert. VI 42. Criticism of providence: Diog. (V B 342 G. [SSR II 362]) ap. Diog. Laert. VI 59. Rejection of the sacred nature of temples: Diog. (V B 353 G. [SSR II 366]) ap. Diog. VI 73 μηδέν τε ἄτοπον εἶναι ἐξ ἱεροῦ λαβεῖν.

218 Winiarczyk, *Wer galt* (1984), 167.

219 Εἰ δέ, ὅτι μὴ προσῄει μηδὲ ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς νεὼς μηδὲ τὰ ἀγάλματα μηδὲ τοὺς βωμούς, οἴεταί τις ἀθεότητος εἶναι σημεῖον, οὐκ ὀρθῶς νομίζει [...] Εἰ δὲ ἐνόει περὶ θεῶν ὀρθῶς, ἤρκει τοῦτο μόνον. Αὐτῇ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐθεράπευσε τῇ ψυχῇ, διδούς, οἶμαι, τὰ τιμιώτατα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ καθοσιῶσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν διὰ τῶν ἐννοιῶν (Iul. Ap. *Or*. 9 Rochefort [*Or*. 6 Hertlein] 199 B).
On Theodorus, see literature cited in chap. IV 1, n. 14.

220 On Theodorus, see literature cited in chap. IV 1, n. 14.

221 Theodorus (T 16 W. = IV H 5 G. [SSR II 120]) = Diogenes (V B 334 G [SSR II 359]) ap. Diog. Laert. VI 42 Λυσίου τοῦ φαρμακοπώλου πυθομένου εἰ θεοὺς νομίζει, 'πῶς δὲ' εἶπεν (scil. Διογένης), 'οὐ νομίζω, ὅπου καὶ σὲ θεοῖς ἐχθρὸν ὑπολαμβάνω;' οἱ δὲ Θεόδωρον εἰπεῖν τοῦτο; Theodor. (T 15 W. = IV H 13 G. [SSR II 126]) ap. Diog. Laert. II 102; Diogenes (V B 334 G. [SSR II 359]) ap. Epict. *Disser*. III 22, 91. There also exist statements on funeral ceremonies attributed to both Diogenes and Theodorus. Diogenes: V B 105 G. (SSR II 276) ap. Cic. *Tusc. disp*. I 104; V B 103 G. (SSR II 276) ap. Stob. IV 55, 11 p. 1119 Hense; V B 555 G. (SSR II 435) ap. Ps.-Diog. *Epist*. 25 p. 28 Müseler. Theodorus: T 8 W. = IV H 8 G. (SSR II 121) ap. Cic. *Tusc. disp*. I 102; T 9 W. = IV H 8 G. ap. Sen. *De tranqu. an*. 14, 3; T 10 W. = IV H 8 G. ap. Val. Max. VI 2 ext. 3; T 11 W. = IV H 8 G. ap. Plut. *An vitios. ad infel. suff*. 3 p. 499 D. See Packmohr, *De Diogenis* (1913), 23–26; von Fritz, *Quellenuntersuchungen* (1926), 50–52.

impiety were deliberately associated with Diogenes. I believe we can rule out that this is a case of a quite inadvertent mixing up of names. Previously I have even tried to show that the anecdote was originally associated with Theodorus and only later attributed to Diogenes.[222]

We should now try to answer the question as to when and who ascribed such anecdotes to Diogenes. Gustav Adolf Gerhard (1878–1918) proposed the hypothesis that a hedonist trend among the Cynics already appeared in the 3rd century BC.[223] These hedonistic Cynics (*die hedonisierenden Kyniker*) – in contrast to rigoristic Cynics (*die strengen Kyniker*) – had at best a sceptical attitude towards the gods. They did not believe in the immortality of the soul and were quite uninterested in the existence of gods or life after death. In Gerhard's opinion, it was these hedonistically inclined Cynics who tried to present their master in this way and therefore ascribed to him hedonistic thoughts, which another tradition ascribed to the most well-known atheists of the ancient world, i.e. Diagoras and Theodorus of Cyrene.[224] Some scholars have argued that a follower of atheistic Cynicism was Bion of Borysthenes (c. 335–c. 245),[225] who deliberately modified the tradition regarding Diogenes. Bion's major role in the development of Cynic philosophy was already noticed towards the end of the 19th century by Otto Hense (1845–1931).[226] Although the ancient tradition states that Bion had atheistic views,[227] it is doubtful that he could be considered a typical Cynic philosopher. According to Diogenes Laertius, Bion was initially a pupil of the Academic Crates, next he joined the Cynics, then

222 Winiarczyk, *Theodoros und Diogenes* (1981), 37–42.

223 Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909), 40 ff.; *idem*, *Zur Legende* (1912), 388–408 (der strenge und hedonische Kynismus).

224 Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909), 81–82; *idem*, *Zur Legende* (1912), 395 ff.

225 On Bion, see, e.g., Kindstrand, *Bion* (1976); *idem*, *Bion* (1994), 108–112; Goulet-Cazé, *Bion* (1997), 689–691; Döring, *Sokrates* (1998), 306–310; Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* (2003), 62–69, 89–92; Desmond, *Cynics* (2008), 33–36.

226 Hense, *Bion bei Philo* (1892), 239 'dass Bion auch ihm überkommene Diogenesüberlieferung mit neuen Zügen ausstattete und sie seiner laxeren Anschauungsweise anbequemte'. Cf. *idem*, *Teletis reliquiae* (1909), LIII.

227 Bion (T 3 Kindstrand) ap. Diog. Laert. IV 54 = Theodor. T 53 W. = IV H 28 G. (SSR II 132) πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἀθεώτερον προεφέρετο τοῖς ὁμιλοῦσι (scil. Βίων), τοῦτο Θεοδώρειον ἀπολαύσας. Bion (T 6 A K.) ap. Diog. Laert. IV 55 λέγειν ἀκούομεν θεοὺς ὡς οὐδέν εἰσιν ὄντως; Bion (T 6 B K.) ap. Ps.-Hesych. Mil. *De viris illustr*. 13 p. 12–13 Flach. See Kindstrand, *Bion* (1976), 240–241. Abernetty, *De Plutarchi* (1911), 88 ff, tried to prove that the diatribe of the atheist Bion was the basis of Plutarch's work περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, in which δεισιδαιμονία is presented as something worse than ἀθεότης. Although this hypothesis was accepted by Erbse, *Plutarchs Schrift* (1952), 299–300, other scholars rightly rejected it, e.g.. Schmid, Stählin, *Geschichte* (1920), II 1, 513 n. 1; Ziegler, *Plutarchos* (1951), 826; Adam, *Plutarchs Schrift* (1974), 49 n. 6; Lozza, *Plutarco* (1980), 24.

he listened to the lectures of Theodorus the Atheist and finally became the student of the Peripatetic Theophrastus.[228] Scholars very diversely assess the philosophical stance of Bion. Hans von Arnim (1859–1931) described Bion as a popular philosopher who could not be connected to any specific school.[229] Although Cynicism must have had some influence on Bion, it is obvious that he did not lead the life of a Cynic, because he charged fees from his pupils, did not refrain from luxuries and lived for a time at the court of the Macedonian king Antigonus II Gonatas in Pella.[230] That is why he cannot be considered a true Cynic who led the κυνικὸς βίος. This is also conceded by those scholars who maintain that Cynic philosophers did have an influence on Bion.[231] Perhaps only Jan Fredrik Kindstrand was adamant that Cynicism had a very profound influence on Bion.[232] The Swedish scholar, however, failed to take into account that the quest for internal freedom (ἐλευθερία), self-

228 Bion (T 19 K.) ap. Diog. Laert. IV 51–52. Scholars doubted whether the succession of Bion's teachers provided by Diogenes Laertius is true. E.g., Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (1901), 70–71. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 33–34 believed that Bion was first the pupil of the Academic Xenocrates of Chalcedon, next probably the pupil of the Cynic Crates, and then of Theodorus and Theophrastus. On the other hand, von Arnim, *Bion* (1897), 483–484, assumed that Diogenes Laertius mistook the Academic Crates for the Cynic Crates. This is not very probable because Diog. Laert. IV 23 (T 20 K.) states that Bion was a pupil of the Academic Crates. Nevertheless, in a new edition of Philod. *PHerc. 1021* (= *Acad. Phil. Ind. Herc.*), col. XVI (S 30) p. 150 Dorandi Bion is considered to have been the pupil of the Academic philosopher Crantor of Soli. Let us add that previously S. Mekler reconstructed *PHerc. 1021* (Berlin 1902) in way that suggests Bion was considered the pupil of Crates (= T 21 K.). The problem of Bion's philosophical education and stance is discussed in detail by Kindstrand, *Bion* (1976), 9–12, 56–78.

229 Von Arnim, *op. cit.*, 483 'Einer bestimmten Schulphilosophie kann er als Popularphilosoph nicht zugerechnet werden, da zum Wesen der Popularphilosophie ein nach Principien gesunden Menschenverstandes geübter Eklekticismus gehört.' Similarly Praechter, *Die Philosophie* (1926), 433 'Bion war kein Schulphilosoph, er ist überhaupt eher als philosophisch gebildeter Literat denn als zünftiger Philosoph zu betrachten.'

230 Kindstrand, *Bion* (1976), 14–15 maintained that staying at a royal court was not contrary to the Cynic's way of life and gave the example of Onesicritus, who accompanied Alexander on his expedition to India. Winiarczyk, *Das Werk* (2007), 199–202, however, argued that Onesicritus could not be considered a Cynic philosopher.

231 See, e.g., Heinze, *Ariston von Chios* (1890), 514; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 35 Bion was a Cynic 'von laxer Observanz'; von Fritz, *Quellenuntersuchungen* (1926), 44–45; Capelle, *Diatribe* (1957), 995 'der freilich seinen Kynismus infolge kyrenaischer Einflüsse stark verfälscht, um nicht zu sagen: verwässert hat'; Goulet-Cazé, *Bion* (1997), 690 'seine Philosophie erscheint als ein gemildeter kynismós, der von einer realistischeren und stärker am praktischen Leben orientierten Einstellung gekennzeichnet ist, als das bei den ersten Kynikern der Fall gewesen war, ja sogar von einem gewissen Opportunismus.'

232 Kindstrand, *Bion* (1976), 58–67, 77 'Therefore I believe that Bion can be called a Cynic without the usual reservations.'

sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια) and uncompromisingly expressing one's views (παρρησία) was not only the preserve of the Cynics, but also of the Cyrenaic school, to which Bion's teacher Theodorus of Cyrene belonged.[233] I think it is more likely that Bion's atheism only began to develop under the influence of Theodorus the Atheist, and not under the influence of the hedonistic Cynics.[234]

Moreover, it should be added that the term 'hedonistic Cynicism' is inappropriate, as was already pointed out by Wilhelm Capelle (1871–1961) in his review of G.A. Gerhard's book.[235] It is also wrong to use the term Cynicism *sensu lato*. Some scholars consider as followers of this philosophy people who, indeed, sympathised with and even propagated Cynic ideals in writing but did not follow them in practice. Included in this group were Bion, Teles, Phoenix of Colophon, Cercidas of Megalopolis and Onesicritus of Astypalaia.[236] I once tried to show that a Cynic philosopher could only be someone who actually led a κυνικὸς βίος.[237] That is why I believe one cannot consider Bion to to have been Cynic.

In my opinion, there is another way one can explain why Diogenes was featured in anecdotes expressing his critical attitude towards the gods. It is possible that these anecdotes were ascribed to Diogenes by the enemies of Cynicism, who

233 Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 76–78, stressed that the Cynics and Cyrenaics adopted from Socrates the ideas of internal freedom and self-sufficiency, but tried to achieve them in different ways. Also see Tsouna McKirahan, *The Socratic Origins* (1994), 367–391. On Cynic ideas, see, e.g., Rich, *The Cynic Conception* (1956), 23–29, reprint in: Billerbeck, *Die Kyniker* (1991), 233–239; Kusch, *Diogenes* (1957), 1063–1065; Giannantoni, *SSR* (1990), IV, 513–527 ('La filosofia di Diogene e l'ideale del saggio cinico'); Goulet-Cazé, *Le cynisme* (1993), 291–301; Döring, *Sokrates* (1998), 287–295,

234 A similar view was also held, among others, by Heinze, *Ariston* (1890), 514; von Arnim, *Bion* (1897), 484; von Fritz, *op. cit*., 44–45 'Bion, der, trotzdem er sich viel mit Diogenes beschäftigte, niemals ein wirklicher Kyniker war und stärker als vom Kynismus wohl immer von seinem Lehrer Theodoros ἄθεος beeinflußt blieb'; Rudberg, *Zum Diogenes-Typus* (1936), 2 n. 2.

235 Capelle, *rev. Gerhard 1909* (1911), 318 'Denn abgesehen von Bion, der überhaupt kein wirklicher Kyniker ist, gibt es im alten Kynismus überhaupt keine hedonische Richtung'. "Hedonischer Kynismus" ist eine *contradictio in adiecto*. – Nur von einer "gemilderten Richtung", wie sie Krates und Metrokles repräsentieren, darf man reden.' Gerhard's hypothesis was accepted, among others, by von Fritz, *op. cit*., 44–46; Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* (1937), 104–106; Malherbe, *Self-Definition* (1982), 50–51; Moles, *The Cynics* (1995), 145 'hard' (Diogenic) Cynicism and 'soft' Cynicism; Stoneman, *The Legacy of Alexander* (2003), 332.

236 See, e.g., Fuentes González, *Les Diatribes de Télès* (1998); Gerhard, *Phoinix* (1909); Goulet-Cazé, López Cruces, *Cercidas* (1994), 269–281; López Cruces, *Les Méliambes de Cercidas* (1995); Winiarczyk, *Das Werk* Die Erziehung Alexanders *des Onesikritos* (2007), 197–250; *idem*, *Die hellenistischen Utopien* (2011), 73–115. On Bion, see n. 225, above.

237 Winiarczyk, *Das Werk* (2007), 199–202; *idem*, *Die hellenistischen Utopien* (2011), 77–79. On the κυνικὸς βίος, see Kalouche, *The Cynic Way of Living* (2003), 181–194. Cf. Goulet-Cazé, *L'Ascèse cynique* (2001), 15–84.

thus accused him of atheism.[238] Already A. Packmohr argued that it was impossible for a story about a statue of Heracles being cast into a fire to have been made up by Cynics,[239] because for them Heracles was a perfect role model. K. von Fritz tried to counter this argument by stating that Heracles was not so important to Diogenes as he would become for Antisthenes and later Cynics.[240] Nevertheless, conceding that this counterargument was not entirely conclusive, he added that originally the statue in the anecdote could have been of another god and the version that it was a statue of Heracles was later added by the enemies of Cynicism.

K. von Fritz also tried to show that the anecdotes were of Cynic provenience and only later ascribed to Diagoras (pp. 53–54). In my opinion, his reasoning was based on some false assumptions. He emphatically stressed that the ancient tradition presented Diagoras as an atheist who sharply attacked belief in gods, but the anecdotes ascribed to both Diagoras and Diogenes rather show 'einen halb gutmütigen, halb grotesken Humor, der zu dem Ton der übrigen Diogenes-Anekdoten vortrefflich paßt' (p. 53). K. von Fritz explained the reason for transferring the anecdote from Diogenes to Diagoras 'in der Anziehungskraft, die eine solche zum Typus gewordene Persönlichkeit auf alle Arten von Erzählungen, die diesem Typus zu entsprechen scheinen, ausübt' (p. 54). However, he failed to notice that an anecdote solely concerning Diagoras has survived with otherwise exactly the same character as the other two. This anecdote is passed on to us by seven authors and all of them associate it exclusively with Diagoras. It concerns the words uttered by Diagoras on a ship during a storm when the passengers wanted to throw him overboard because they felt his presence was drawing on them the wrath of the gods (see chap. IV 5 B with n. 201). I believe this fact undermines K. von Fritz's arguments and entitles us to conclude that all three anecdotes were initially, in the Hellenistic period, attributed to Diagoras.[241]

238 Thus Winiarczyk, *Diagoras und Diogenes* (1976), 182–184. This view was accepted by Goulet-Cazé, *Les premiers cyniques* (1993), 147; *eadem*, *Religion* (1996), 71. It is worth adding that Stoics fabricated the writings of Epicurus to compromise him in the eyes of others. E.g., the Stoic Diotimus (2nd/1st century BC) published 50 letters defaming Epicurus: Διότιμος δ' ὁ Στωικὸς δυσμενῶς ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν πικρότατα αὐτὸν διαβέβληκεν, ἐπιστολὰς φέρων πεντήκοντα ἀσελγεῖς ὡς Ἐπικούρου (Diog. Laert. X 3 = fr. 104, 2 Usener). Cf. Athen. XIII 92, 611 B (manuscripts give the variant Θεότιμος). The pupils of Posidonius of Apamea behaved in a similar manner (fr. 288 Edelstein-Kidd = fr. 290 b Theiler). Other persons criticising Epicurus are mentioned by Diog. Laert. X 3–4. See Kidd, *Posidonius* (1988), II, 976–978 and chap. II 4, n. 89.

239 Packmohr, *op. cit.*, 21.

240 Von Fritz, *op. cit.*, 54. A similar view was held by Sayre, *Diogenes* (1938), 61–62, but later scholars, especially Höistad, *Cynic Hero* (1948), argued that Heracles was an ideal for the Cynics.

241 Likewise, Burkert, *Concordia Discors* (1993), 189 n. 32, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften III* (2006), 143 n. 32 and Navia, *Diogenes* (1998), 177 n. 92, have argued that the anecdotes were originally associated with Diagoras.

We cannot determine exactly when these anecdotes were linked with Diogenes. It could have happened during the Hellenistic period or perhaps as late as the 1st/2nd century AD, when interest in Cynicism increased. Either way it must have happened before 200 AD, since Diogenes Laertius knew that these anecdotes were variously ascribed to Diogenes, Diagoras (Diog. Laert. VI 59) and Theodorus (Diog. Laert. VI 42).

6. Was Diagoras a radical atheist?

While some scholars tried to defend Diagoras against the charge of atheism,[242] others have argued that the ancient tradition rightly accused him of being a radical atheist. A supporter of the latter was Felix Jacoby (1876–1959), who maintained that Diagoras espoused 'an atheism radical, extreme, and uncompromising' (p. 26), and this 'secured for him a place not only in ancient doxography, but also in the history of Greek and European thought'.[243] Jacoby used the following arguments to support his claim:

a. When Aristophanes wanted to denounce Socrates as an impious person in his comedy the *Clouds* (v. 830), he gave him the epithet Μήλιος, which was an allusion to the atheism of Diagoras of Melos.
b. There existed an atheistic book which by c. 300 BC was already known to Aristoxenus and Epicurus. It was a purely polemical work, entirely devoted to questioning the existence of the gods. If it were otherwise, the ancient tradition would have passed on to us information on the theories of Diagoras.

242 Sittl, *Geschichte* (1887), III, 111 (Diagoras owed his fame as an atheist to the ridicule of comedy writers and anecdotes). Other scholars assumed that Diagoras' activity in this area was limited to ridiculing the Eleusinian Mysteries and revealing their secrets, e.g.: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgeschichte* (1900), 84; Geffcken, *Zwei griech. Apologeten* (1907), 169; Bury, *The Age of Illumination* (1927), 383; Praechter, *Die Philosophie* (1926), 129 'nichts darauf deutet, daß der Atheismus … philosophisch begründet gewesen wäre'; Lana, *Diagora* (1950), 178, reprint in: *idem*, *Studi* (1973), 78 'fu colpevole soltanto di aver divulgato i misteri'; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb* (1962), 42; Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 206 'the atheism of Diagoras, though notorious, is elusive and indefinite', 208 'Nowhere we find evidence of an intellectual defence of atheism'; *idem*, *review of Guthrie, A History* (1970), 353 'we have no reason to attribute to him an intellectually based atheism'; Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1989), 454 'Diagoras was an *atheos* only in the old sense of an "ungodly" man; he was not, properly speaking, an atheist'; Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 281 n. 347; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 168 n. 43; Gagné, *Mystery Inquisitors* (2009), 223 'Diagoras was condemned to death for mocking the Mysteries, not for his views on the world or his ideas about divinity.'

243 Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959), 31, ll. 24–25.

c. Diagoras was given the epithet ἄθεος (similarly to Theodorus of Cyrene) and in antiquity was considered ἄθεος κατ' ἐξοχήν.
d. Diagoras appears in most of the catalogues of atheists.

I discussed the first argument in chap. II 2 A, and the second argument is invalid since I have shown that the atheistic book is apocryphal (see chap. IV 4 A-C). On the other hand, the third and fourth arguments do deserve more attention. It is true that almost all the ancient tradition maintains that Diagoras was a typical atheist who generally denied the existence of gods and for this reason was recorded in the catalogues of atheists. Initially, this argument makes quite a strong impression, which is why some scholars accepted F. Jacoby's explanation.[244] A more careful examination of the matter, however, may lead us to a quite different conclusion.

F. Jacoby and other scholars did not consider the fact that it is the quality of the testimonies and not their quantity that is most important. The catalogues of atheists usually come from the works of authors of the Roman Empire period (chiefly doxographers and the Church Fathers), i.e. people living five centuries or even seven or eight centuries after Diagoras. The earliest testimony comes from Cicero's treatise *De natura deorum* (1st century BC). Therefore, it is clear that these authors must have acquired their information from secondary sources and repeated it uncritically. Indeed, such an extensive passage of time meant that they probably had no possibility of verifying the information passed on by earlier authors. It seems that a large proportion of atheist catalogues relied on a list of atheists drawn up towards the end of the 2nd century BC by Clitomachus of Carthage, the scholarch of the Academy in the years 127/126 – 110/109.[245] It should also be noted, that some Christian authors relied on each other, e.g. Arnobius (T 63) relied on Clement of Alexandria (T 62),[246] and Epiphanius (T 28) also most

244 Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN* (1969), 88–92; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 237; Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* (1969), II, 958; Fredouille, *Götzendienst* (1981), 836 'der als erster in Griechenland offen die Existenz der Götter zu leugnen wagte'; van der Horst, *The First Atheist* (2006), 248 'presented a systematic argument against beliefs in god(s)' and 249 'the first outspoken atheist'; Whitmarsh, *Battling the Gods* (2016), 124 'perhaps we can suggest, tentatively, that Diagoras was the first person in history to self-identify in a positive way as an atheist'.

245 Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976), 32–46; *idem*, *Starożytne wykazy* (1977), 3–92; Also see Runia, *Atheists in Aëtius*. (1996) 542–576, reprint in: Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana III* (2010), 343–373. Gigon, *Die antike Kultur* (1966), 106 n. 84, maintained that a catalogue of atheists compiled by an Epicurean in the 3rd century BC, but he failed to justify his opinion. The fullest catalogues of atheists were provided by Cic. *Nat. deor*. I 117–119 and Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. IX 50–58. Also see Aëtius, *Plac. phil*. I 7, 1–2 p. 297–298 Diels = Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil*. 880 DF.

246 Thus for example Röhricht, *De Clemente Alexandrino* (1892), 23–24; Geffcken, *Zwei griech. Apologeten* (1907), 288; Rapisarda, *Clemente fonte di Arnobio* (1939), 54–55; Sitte, *Mythologische*

probably relied on Clement of Alexandria. Therefore, scholars who maintain that the radical atheism of Diagoras may be proved if they cite a number of testimonies from the works of writers living the Roman Empire period or Cicero's work *De natura deorum* are making a serious methodological mistake.[247]

In my opinion they have made yet another methodological error by trying to answer the vague question as to whether or not Diagoras was an atheist. Instead a clear distinction should be made between two very different aspects of this question: 1) whether or not ancient authors were right to call Diagoras an atheist, 2) whether or not Diagoras could be considered a radical atheist today. These are two completely different questions and the individual answers to them do not have to be the same. Clitomachus was absolutely justified to call Diagoras an atheist because he considered him to be the author of an atheistic book who criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries and revealed their secrets. He also knew that Diagoras escaped from Athens in 415/414 to avoid the charge of impiety. Moreover, in Clitomachus' day there existed three anecdotes which illustrated Diagoras' critical attitude towards the belief in gods. However, we should remember that the concept of impiety (ἀσέβεια) encompassed diverse transgressions, which did not necessarily mean denying the existence of gods. Likewise the term ἄθεος initially did not mean atheist, but instead *godless*, *immoral, heinous* or more rarely *abandoned by the gods* (see chap. IV 1). The word ἄθεος in the sense 'who denies the existence of gods' first appeared in Plato's *Apology* (26 C). Later writers of the same period gave the word ἄθεος various meanings, which is why in each case we have to consider how the given ancient author understood the term. It is worth adding that the Jews and Christians were also considered atheists, who in turn called pagans atheists. The Christians, moreover, even called heretics of their own religion atheists. I believe that the concept of atheism as the 'negation of the existence of any type of deity or supernatural forces' did not emerge in Greece until around 400 BC (see chap. IV 2). Four factors probably contributed to its emergence: 1) criticism of anthropomorphism and the immorality of Olympian gods, which was begun by Xenophanes of Colophon in the 6th century, 2) a rationalistic criticism of myths, which was first applied by Hecataeus of Miletus c. 500,

Quellen (1970), 1–20. Differently Tullius, *Die Quellen des Arnobius* (1934), 96–98, but his arguments do not seem very convincing.

247 Earlier, at the start of the 4th BC, Diagoras' attitude to the gods was criticised by Pseudo-Lysias (T 16) (see chap. II 3) and Epicurus (T 38) at the end of the 4th century (see chap. IV 1, n. 17 and chap. V, n. 43). However, the Peripatetic Aristoxenus of Tarentum (4th century BC) and the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara (1st century BC) [T 69] defended Diagoras against the charge of atheism. The former considered the tradition that Diagoras was an atheist to be unauthentic, whereas the latter thought that Diagoras only joked about the gods (see chap. II 4).

3) a materialistic and mechanistic concept of the formation of the world as well as natural explanations of natural phenomena, which first appeared in Presocratic philosophy, 4) the view that religion was of human invention in the second half of the 5th century (the theories of Prodicus of Ceos, Democritus of Abdera and Critias of Athens). In my opinion, one cannot say any one of these reasons was the most important. Only when taken all together, was the right intellectual atmosphere created, which towards the end of the 5th century BC led to the appearance of the first radical atheists. We cannot rule out that the long plague in Athens during the Peloponnesian War may have inclined some people to deny the existence of gods, because the victims were not only the wicked and impious (the plague was then interpreted as divine punishment), but also the pious and good.

In my opinion, Diagoras was not a radical atheist, because the atheistic book ascribed to him is apocryphal and the story that he was a pious poet who converted to atheism was an invention of Hellenistic biographers. It was also from the Hellenistic period that the three anecdotes demonstrating his critical attitude to the gods originate (see chap. IV 5). The only certain fact from Diagoras' life is therefore his criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries and disclosure of their secrets. There is no evidence to support the view that Diagoras' 'atheism' had any philosophical basis.[248] Some scholars have overestimated the importance of Diagoras in history by considering him to have been one of the leaders of progressive thought in Athens, alongside Anaxagoras and Socrates.[249] It is also doubtful that Diagoras moved in the enlightened circles of Athens or participated in parodies of the Eleusinian Mysteries in the house of Alcibiades.[250] Hardly convincing is the hypothesis which sees Diagoras as the 'literary instigator of the profanation of the mysteries'.[251] More plausible is the view that Diagoras should be associated with the dithyrambic poets who ridi-

248 See n. 242 above. The forming of the Diagoras legend was well presented by Geffcken, *Zwei griech. Apologeten* (1907), 169 'In ältester Zeit hatte man nur davon Kunde (Aristoph. *Vögel* 1071; *Frösche* 320; vgl. Andokides I 29), dass er den eleusinischen Gottesdienst verspottet habe; die anderen Geschichten sind erst später über ihn aufgebracht worden, als er in den Doxographien das Musterbeispiel für alle Gottlosigkeit im Verein mit Protagoras, Theodoros, Euhemeros u.a. wurde und sein Name aus diesen Zusammenstellungen in die jüdischen und christlichen Schriften überging.'

249 Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1956), 189, believed that Diagoras belonged to 'the leaders of progressive thought at Athens' (alongside Anaxagoras, Socrates, Protagoras and Euripides). On the stance of R. Janko, see chap. V.

250 Nestle, *Vom Mythos* (1942), 418–419, 'der sicherlich in den aufgeklärten Kreisen Athens verkehrte und wahrscheinlich auch an der frivolen Nachaffung der eleusinischen Mysterien im Haus des Alkibiades beteiligt war.'

251 Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 494, 'Erst der Mysterienfrevel des Jahres 415 wird die Aufmerksamkeit auf ihn als den (literarischen) Anstifter der Mysterienverachtung gelenkt.' See chap. III, n. 69.

culed the gods and religious ceremonies of Athens.[252] Particularly interesting is the poet Cinesias,[253] whom the comedy writers keenly criticised for his external looks, his poetry and his behaviour.[254] It should be stressed that he, too, was accused of impiety.[255] Cinesias was also well-known for the fact that he belonged to the private religious society called κακοδαιμονισταί (i.e. worshippers of κακὸς δαίμων). Its members met to feast or perhaps offer sacrifices on days considered to be inauspicious. The choice of such a name (there existed religious groups that worshipped ἀγαθὸς δαίμων) and the days they met were a deliberate provocation and blasphemy. Lysias stressed that members of this club mocked the gods and laws of Athens. The orator adds that three members of the group soon died, whereas the gods chose to punish Cinesias in a different way. He was plagued by numerous diseases and other misfortunes, which were worse than a swift death.[256]

In my opinion, the closest to the truth is the assumption that Diagoras' stance was a manifestation of the decline of cult piety (*Kultfrömmigkeit*) in Athens towards the end of the 5th century BC.[257]

---

252 Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 125; Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 210–211. Differently, Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen* (1990), 282 n. 347.

253 See Maas, *Kinesias* (1921), 479–481; Schmid, *Geschichte* (1946), I 4, 495–497; Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos* (1992), 118–119; *idem*, *Aristophanes und die Intellektuellen* (1993), 270–275; Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (1995), 660–669; Kugelmeister, *Reflexe* (1996), 208–248; Ieranò, *Il ditirambo* (1997), 309–312, 365–366; *idem*, *'One Who Is Fought over by all the Tribes'* (2013), 378–383. Edition: PMG 774–776; Sutton, *Dithyrambographi* (1989), 49–53 (No. 22).

254 Aristoph. *Aves* 1372–1409; *Eccles*. 329–330; Γηρυτάδης, fr. 156 Kassel-Austin (PCG III 2, 102) ap. Athen. XII 75, 551 AC; *Ran*. 153, 366, 1437; Pherecrates, Χείρων, fr. 155 K.-A. (PCG VII 180) ap. Ps.-Plut. *De mus*. 30, 1141 EF; Strattis, Κινησίας, fr. 14–22 K.-A. (PCG VII 631–634) ap. Athen. XII 76, 551 D (PCG VII 631–634); Pl. Comicus, fr. 200 K.-A. (PCG VII 518). Also see Lys. fr. 196 Carey; Ael. *Var. hist*. X 6. Webster, *Studies* (1953), 28 and Sanders, *Dionysius I* (1987), 14, assumed that the attacks on Cinesias originated from circles hostile to Dionysius I, because he proposed as βουλευτής a decree honouring the tyrant of Syracuse in 394/393 (GHI II^2 108 = IG II^2 18 = SIG I^3 128).

255 Strattis, Κινησίας, fr. 17 K.-A. ap. Harpocr. s.v. Κινησίας; Lys. fr. 195 Carey (= fr. 53 Thalheim) ap. Athen. XII 76, 551 EF ἀσεβέστατον ἁπάντων καὶ παρανομώτατον ἀνθρώπων; Suda s.v. Κινησίας (III 119 Adler) ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ καὶ παρανομίᾳ διετεθρύλλητο. See Winiarczyk, *Wer galt* (1984), 162.

256 Lys. fr. 195 Carey ap. Athen. XII 76, 551 F–552 B μίαν ἡμέραν ταξάμενοι τῶν ἀποφράδων, ἀντὶ δὲ νουμηνιαστῶν κακοδαιμονιστὰς σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τοὔνομα θέμενοι, πρέπον μὲν ταῖς αὐτῶν τύχαις· οὐ μὴν ὡς τοῦτο διαπραξόμενοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἔσχον, ἀλλ' ὡς καταγελῶντες τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων τῶν ὑμετέρων. See Murray, *The Affair* (1990), 157; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 335–336.

257 Wehrli, *review of Jacoby* (1961), 126 'So unscharf die Erscheinung des Diagoras in den Einzelumrissen bleibt, gehört sie jedenfalls nicht in die Philosophiegeschichte. Vielmehr ist sie eines der Symptome für den allgemeinen Zerfall der Kultfrömmigkeit, der gegen Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts um sich gegriffen hat.'

V. Diagoras as the Supposed Author of the Commentary on the Derveni Papyrus

In 1962 six graves were discovered on the then being widened road from Salonika (Thessaloniki) to Kavala. They were found near Derveni, a narrow pass some 10 km to the north of Salonika. On the slab covering tomb A were found the remains of a funeral pyre, including the charred top part of a papyrus scroll (= *PDerv.*).[1] It was unravelled by Anton Fackelmann, a conservator at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna. It then turned out that most of the upper part of the papyrus scroll (col. VII–XXVI) contains an allegorical commentary to an Orphic theogony.[2] Most scholars agree that the papyrus originates from the second half of the 4th century,[3] whereas the commentary was written around 400 BC.[4] Dirk Obbink has tried to prove that the commentary had been read by the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara.[5]

As one would expect, scholars have tried to identify the author of this exceptionally interesting text and, naturally, it was realised that none of the hypotheses could be proven satisfactorily. The possible authors taken into consideration are:

a. Epigenes, who, according to Clement of Alexandria, wrote Orphic poetry (*Strom.* I 21, 131, 5),[6]

1 On the discovery of the graves, see Themelis, Touratsoglou, *Οἱ τάφοι του Δερβενίου* (1997), 23–59; Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 56–73; Tsantsanoglou, *Introduction* (2006), 1–4.

2 Editions of the papyrus: Janko (2002); Jourdan (2003); Betegh (2004); Tsantsanoglou, Parássoglou (2006); Bernabé (2007). Also see Janko, *Reconstructing* (2008), 37–51 (reconstruction of col. I–V); Ferrari, *Derveni Papyrus* (2012) [reconstruction of col. I–VI]. A good introduction to the subject is provided by Laks, Most (eds.), *Studies* (1997); Tsantsanoglou, Kouremenos, *Introduction* (2006), 1–59; Papadopoulou, Muellner (eds.), *Poetry as Initiation* (2014); Tsantsanoglou, *Der Papyrus von Derveni* (2014), 446–452.

3 C. 350: Burkert, *Die altorphische Theogonie* (2006), 95–96; Janko, *Reconstructing* (2008), 37; 340–320: Tsantsanoglou, Parássoglou (1988), 125; Hussey, *The Enigmas* (1999), 304; c. 330: Burkert, *Die Griechen* (2003), 96; c. 325: Bremmer, *Götter* (2006), 98; the last quarter of the 4th century: Parker, *Early Orphism* (1995), 488; Differently, Irigoin, *Les Manuscrits* (1972), 547: 'le milieu du IVe siècle, sinon même la première moitié.' Turner, *Greek Papyri* (1980), 1, 39: 4th century BC.

4 420–400: Henry, *The Derveni Commentator* (1986), 150; Burkert, *Die altorphische Theogonie* (2006), 96; c. 400: Burkert, *Die Griechen* (2003), 104; West, *The Orphic Poems* (1983), 77 'not before 400', 82 'the earlier fourth century rather than the fifth'; Sider, *Heraclitus* (1997), 138, after 400; Price, *Religions* (1999), 117 'in the early fourth century'; 400–350: Henrichs, *The Eumenides* (1984), 255. On the other hand, Brisson, *review of Betegh* (2006), 10–11 tries to show that the work was written under the influence of a Stoic allegoresis and not Presocratic philosophy.

5 Obbink, *A Quotation* (1994), 111–136.

6 Kapsomenos, *The Orphic Papyrus Roll* (1964/65), 12; Edwards, *Notes* (1991), 205.

b. Euthyphro, about whom Plato wrote in his dialogues *Euthyphro* and *Cratylus*,[7]
c. Stesimbrotus of Thasus, the author of the treatise Περὶ τελετῶν,[8]
d. Prodicus of Ceos.[9]

Richard Janko discussed all the above hypotheses in detail, and then rejected them.[10] He also considered the authorship of four other writers – Anaximander of Miletus (FGrHist 9), Glaucon, Metrodorus of Lampsacus (DK 61), who allegorically interpreted the poetry of Homer, and the Presocratic philosopher Diogenes of Apollonia (DK 64) – but again came to the conclusion that none of them could have been the author of *PDerv.*[11] Finally he put forward the hypothesis that the author could have been Diagoras of Melos.[12] He provided detailed justification of this theory in subsequent articles, putting forward the following arguments:[13]

a. The Christian apologist Athenagoras (*Leg*. 4, 1 = Diag. T 27) writes that Diagoras revealed an Ὀρφικὸς λόγος and publicised the Eleusinian and Cabeiri (i.e. Samothracian) mysteries. R. Janko accepts the hypothesis of Martin West, according to which the Orphic fragments cited by Athenagoras[14] originated from the theogony of Hieronymus (c. 200 BC.), which in turn was to supposed to be a reworking of the so-called 'Protogonos theogony' (c. 500 B.C.).[15] However, the source of the Orphic poetry cited in *PDerv.* is an abridged version of the Protogonos theogony.[16]

7 Kahn, *Was Euthyphro* (1997), 55–63; Tsantsanoglou, *The First Columns* (1997), 122 n. 54; *idem*, *Der Papyrus von Derveni* (2014), 450.

8 Burkert, *Der Autor* (1986), 1–5, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften III* (2006), 89–94; *idem*, *Die altorphische Theogonie* (2006), 96.

9 Andrei Lebedev, *The Derveni Treatise as a Document of Sophistic Atheism. With Some Remarks on the Authorship* – an unpublished lecture delivered at Princeton in 1993. This hypothesis is recalled by Sider, *Heraclitus* (1997), 129 n. 2 and Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 75 with n. 124.

10 Janko, *op. cit*., 70–75.

11 Janko, *op. cit*., 75–87.

12 Janko, *op. cit*., 87–92.

13 Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 1–32; *idem*, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 1–18; *idem*, *Socrates the Freethinker* (2006), 48–62, esp. 54 ff. The last work not only repeats the arguments presented in an earlier article, but in it the author also copies literally entire sentences or even passages, only sometimes slightly altering them. Janko also defends his conclusion in a review of a book by Betegh (BMCR 2005.01.27) and the article *Reconstructing* (2008), 38, 51

14 Athenag. *Leg*. 18 (T 57 Kern), 20 (T 58), 32 (T 59). These three fragments were divided into many smaller parts in the edition by A. Bernabé (Monachii-Lipsiae, 2004–2005).

15 West, *The Orphic Poems* (1983), 180–182, 229.

16 West, *op. cit*., 108, 260.

b. The Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara (*De pietate*, pars I, col. 19, ll. 519–541 Obbink) states that Epicurus criticised Prodicus, Diagoras and Critias and accused them of interpreting the names of gods by rearranging the letters (παραγραμμίζ[ουσι] τὰ τ[ῶ]ν θεῶν [ὀνό]ματα). This is why R. Janko believes that these three people applied allegorical interpretations in their works.
c. The Peripatetic Aristoxenus of Tarentum knew the book ascribed to Diagoras in the 4th century, but considered it to be unauthentic because he had also read Diagoras' pious poetry.[17]
d. In his comedy the *Clouds* (vv. 828–830 = Diag. T 38) Aristophanes attributed to Socrates the view that the world was now ruled by Vortex (Δῖνος), who had overthrown Zeus. He gave the philosopher a nickname, the Melian (Μήλιος), to suggest that he shared the views of Diagoras of Melos. This comedy clearly reveals the influences of the natural philosophy of Diogenes of Apollonia, which is why R. Janko is convinced that Socrates and Diagoras were supporters of that Presocratic philosopher. Moreover, they believed in new gods, who were presented in the natural philosophy of Anaxagoras.[18] The influences of the philosophy of Diogenes are also discernible in *PDerv.*, which is why the author of the commentary to the Orphic theogony had to be Diagoras, who was a supporter of allegorical interpretation. The book was written in the 430s or 420s BC,[19] and it includes traces of the Doric dialect, which would suit an author from the Doric island of Melos.[20]
e. Diagoras was a philosopher or a sophist [21] who considered the basic element to be air, which was also the mind and god. He believed he could provide a better explanation of the mysteries and the Ὀρφικὸς λόγος than contemporary religious experts by using a natural allegory. He also promised to provide a truer insight into the nature of god than the hierophants at Eleusis. Diago-

17 Aristoxenus fr. 45 a Wehrli² ap. Philod. *PHerc. 1428*, col. XI–XII 12, ed. A. Henrichs = Diag. T 69. See my interpretation of this testimony in chap. II 4.

18 Janko, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 16, considers credible Plato's account (*Phaed*. 97 b – 98 b), which speaks of Socrates studying the philosophy of Anaxagoras. He also considers it probable that Socrates accepted the teleological version of Anaxagoras' philosophy in the 420s or somewhat earlier.

19 Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 92. Later, however, he thought that Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι were published before 423 or at the latest in 418, when the second version of Aristophanes' *Clouds* was created (*The Derveni Papyrus* [2001], 7).

20 Examples of the Doric form are given by Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 63. However, Tsantsanoglou, *Introduction* (2006), 11–14 ('Dialect'), does not mention any Doric forms.

21 Philosopher: Janko, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 11; Sophist: Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 2, 6; Intellectual: Janko, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 18.

ras tried to reconcile science and religion thanks to allegory and etymology. Thus he tried to explain the immoral myths of Orphic cosmogony. Such views were, however, considered 'atheistic', which is why the People's Assembly in Athens passed a decree that called for the killing of Diagoras.[22]

In *PDerv.* (col. XX) Diagoras ridicules those who were initiated in the Orphic mysteries. Diagoras could have aroused doubts among readers as to whether there was any point in becoming initiated in the mysteries. This would have no doubt outraged the itinerant priests who conducted the initiations, since Diagoras had revealed the sacred text of Orpheus and proposed his own allegorical interpretation. It was probably considered very offensive for someone to state that the sacred poem was an encrypted version of a new-fangled natural philosophy which equated god with air. Likewise the Eleusinian priests could have been deeply offended by the criticism of the public initiation at the start of col. XX and the disclosure of the fact that the initiated offered sacrifices to the Eumenides, typically Athenian deities (col. VI). Moreover, it could have also been considered extremely offensive to state that the δαίμονες and Eumenides were the souls of the dead.[23]

f. Applying allegorical and etymological techniques for the interpretation of sacred texts, such as the poetry of Homer and Orpheus, and showing that they contained scientific truths, was in conservative religious circles considered a threat to traditional faith. Thus the violent fundamentalist backlash that led to the issuing of death sentences, first against Diagoras and next against Socrates.[24]

In my opinion, the arguments put forward by R. Janko are hardly convincing.

a. Athenagoras was the only ancient author to write that Diagoras revealed the Ὀρφικὸς λόγος and the secrets of the Samothracian Mysteries. All the other ancient authors believe that Diagoras criticised only the Eleusinian Mysteries. Even if we accept the highly hypothetical 'stemma of Orphic Theogonies' proposed by M.L. West,[25] the link between the Athenagoras source and the theogony cited in *PDerv*. is fairly tenuous.[26] Apart from that, it is quite unknown how Athenagoras could have acquired such information about Diagoras.[27] We cannot rule out the possibility that the Christian apologist,

22 Janko, *The Physicist* (1997), 92; *idem*, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2001), 12–13.

23 Janko, *God, Science* (2002/2003), 13–14.

24 Janko, *op. cit*., 18.

25 West, *The Orphic Poems* (1983), 264.

26 This was pointed out by Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 375.

27 Schoedel, *Legatio* (1972), XIX–XXIII, discusses Athenagoras' various sources, but does not state which one provided the apologist with the information found in c. 4.

who was interested in Orphic poetry (see n. 14), added to the impious deeds of Diagoras the revealing of the Orphic *logos*, which contained immoral myths.[28] However, the profanation of the Samothracian Mysteries was probably deduced from the anecdote (T 36–37), in which Diagoras criticised those who became initiated in the Cabeiri mysteries so as to ensure for themselves safe sea journeys (see chap. IV 5 B). It is worth adding that scholars have for a long time been interested in finding the source of the Orphic fragments cited by Athenagoras, but R. Janko has not examined this problem in detail.[29]

Moreover, it should be stressed that *PDerv.* does not include an attack on the Eleusinian Mysteries and does not reveal their secrets.[30] On the other hand, other ancient writers maintain that this was the reason why such a high reward was offered for Diagoras' capture or murder.

Although in col. XX (= T 470 Bernabé) the author of *PDerv.* criticises persons conducting initiations, his intention is certainly not to discourage people from participating in such initiations. He only wishes to convince them that only he knows the proper way to initiate people in the mysteries and is able to fully explain this. There is nothing to suggest that the author of *PDerv*. wanted to lessen the value of the Orphic mysteries.[31] Already some time ago, Walter Burkert (1931–2015) noted that the rivalry between various types of specialists was well testified (see Hes. *Op*. 25–26).[32] Probable seems the hypothesis that the author of *PDerv.* could have been one of the priests referred to by Socrates in Plato's dialogue *Menon*.[33] Although it cannot be conclusively proven that the author actually conducted initiations, i.e. that he was τελεστής, it is clear that

28 Thus Betegh, *op. cit*., 376.

29 See Zeegers-VanderVorst, *Les citations des poètes* (1972), 144–153; Pouderon, *Athénagore* (1989), 342–344; Herrero de Jáuregui, *Orphism* (2010), 167–170; Jourdan, *Orphée* (2011), II, 20–34, 316–318; *eadem*, *Orpheus* (2014), 593 (mentions three hypotheses).

30 Nevertheless, some scholars saw an allusion to the Eleusinian Mysteries at the start of col. XX, where there is a critical remark on the initiations in the poleis. Rusten, *Interim Notes* (1985), 139, states that 'the entire passage avoids reference to specific rituals, but εἶδον ... and λεγόμενα ... have Eleusinian overtones'; Graf, *Textes orphiques* (1991), 98 'on pense à Eleusis'; Jourdan, *Le Papyrus* (2003), 85 n. 1 'Ce premier groupe de pratiquants évoqué ici pourrait désigner les initiés d'Eleusis par exemple.' In my opinion, however, this is an over interpretation.

31 As noted by Obbink, *Cosmology* (1997), 52; Edmonds, *Extra-Ordinary People* (2008), 32.

32 Burkert, *Craft versus Sect* (1982), 9, reprint in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften III* (2006), 201. Similarly, Obbink, *op. cit*., 52; Edmonds, *op. cit.,* 33 n. 79, drew attention to the agonistic element in the actions of soothsayers.

33 West, *Hocus-Pocus* (1997), 83; Betegh, *op. cit*., 350–351. Cf. Pl. *Meno* 81 a ἀκήκοα γὰρ ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν σοφῶν περὶ τὰ θεῖα πράγματα [...] οἱ μὲν λέγοντές εἰσι τῶν ἱερῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἱερειῶν ὅσοις μεμέληκε περὶ ὧν μεταχειρίζονται λόγον οἵοις τ' εἶναι διδόναι.

he considered Orpheus to be a great religious authority.[34] Naturally, we will never really know the purpose behind the allegorical exegesis of the Orphic theogony. We have to accept that every interpretation will be subjective and no one will be able to irrefutably prove any particular hypothesis.[35]

b. It is obvious that Aristophanes presented Socrates as a supporter of the philosophy of Diogenes of Apollonia. This was already noted by Hermann Diels (1848–1922) towards the end of the 19th century, which is why he included three fragments from the *Clouds* comedy (vv. 225 ff., 828 ff., 264) in the *Nachwirkung* of that philosopher (DK 64 C 1–2).[36] On the other hand, it is debatable whether Socrates was really a supporter of this philosophy in the 420s BC and whether the *Clouds* may be considered a valid source for determining the views held by Socrates. R. Janko accepted without any reservations the interpretation proposed by Paul A. Vander Waerdt,[37] and seemingly ignored the opinions of many outstanding scholars who maintained that the image of Socrates in the *Clouds* had nothing to do with the real person but was instead a personification of the entire sophistic movement, the actual target of Aristophanes' sharp attack.[38] It should be added that scholars variously assess the plausibil-

34 Obbink, *Cosmology* (1997), 52; Edmonds, *Extra-Ordinary People* (2008), 34–35; Edmonds, *Redefining Ancient Orphism* (2013), 124–138. Differently: Henrichs, The *Eumenides* (1984), 255 'his attitude is decidedly non-Orphic or even anti-Orphic'; Casadio, *Adversaria Orphica* (1987), 386 'È aberrante ritenere che l'autore del comm. al poema orfica sia parimenti un orfico. Lo spirito dell' anonimo commentatore è decisamente estraneo alla temperie orfica, come dimostrano i vistosi fraintendimenti del testo del poema.' Cf. Parker, *Early Orphism* (1995), 489 'If the commentator thought of himself as an Orphic, he was surely one of a very single stamp. For our purposes, he is just the misty glass through which we seek to gaze at Orpheus.'

35 Various interpretations are discussed by Kouremenos, *Introduction* (2006), 45–58.

36 Diels, *Über Leukipp und Demokrit* (1881), in: *idem*, *Kleine Schriften* (1969), 185–198; Also see Byl, *La parodie de Diogène* (1994), 5–9; Vander Waerdt, *Socrates* (1994), 61–66. On the role played by Diogenes in the history of philosophy, see Graham, *Explaining the Cosmos* (2006), 277–293; Laks, *Diogène* (2008); *idem*, *Speculating about Diogenes* (2008), 353–364; Rechenauer, *Diogenes* (2013), 811–832. It is worth adding that according to Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 377 n. 18, scholars exaggeratedly stress the influence of Diogenes in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, because in the comedy one can also note the influence of the philosopher Archelaus of Athens [DK 60] (*op. cit.*, 321–324). Similarly Betegh, *Socrate et Archélaos* (2013), 87–106.

37 Vander Waerdt, *op. cit.*, 48–86. On Socrates as a natural philosopher, see Althoff, *Sokrates als Naturphilosoph* (2007), 103–120; Döring, *Sokrates und die Naturphilosophie* (2010), 9–23. Cf. Konstan, *Socrates* (2011), 75–90.

38 E.g. Maier, *Sokrates* (1913), 162 'Sokrates galt dem Dichter … als der gefährlichste Repräsentant, als die Verkörperung der ganzen Aufklärung, als der bedeutendste und erfolgreichste Weber für den modernen Geist. Gegen diesen Sokrates wandte sich der Angriff der "Wolken" … Sofern aber in Sokrates nicht die Persönlichkeit als solche, sondern der Führer der Aufklärung,

ity of Plato's account (*Phaedo* 97 b – 98 b) of how Socrates had studied in his youth the philosophy of Anaxagoras. Moreover, it is debatable whether Plato's *Apology* includes Socrates' actual words during the trial or whether this is literary fiction. It seems that R. Janko has failed to take into account the existence of various other attempts to reach the historical Socrates and the fact that some scholars regard this to be unattainable.[39] Therefore, it should be clearly stated that all attempts to solve the Socratic question will be of a subjective nature and scholars should not delude themselves that they can produce a hypothesis that would conclusively resolve a several centuries old debate.

R. Janko maintains that Diagoras was a supporter of the philosophy of Diogenes of Apollonia because Aristophanes calls Socrates a Melian. However, a more probable view is that the comedy writer makes the allusion to Diagoras because the poet was considered impious and not because Socrates was a follower of Diagoras' philosophy.[40] It should be stressed that no ancient author provides evidence that Diagoras was a supporter of the Presocratic philosophy of nature. The ancient tradition also does not provide any supposed arguments Diagoras used to question the existence of the gods or propose a new philosophical concept to replace traditional religion. Although some ancient authors do link Diagoras with philosophers or call him a natural philosopher, this can be easily explained. In antiquity it was believed that the existence of gods could only be denied by people with a philosophical education. Diagoras was called a philosopher only because he was considered an atheist.[41]

---

im Führer aber die Aufklärungsbewegung selbst getroffen werden sollte'; Dover, *Aristophanes, Clouds* (1968), XXXII–LVI, esp. XL 'most of the elements in Aristophanes'portrayal of Socrates can be identified either as general characteristics of the sophists or as general characteristics of some contemporary intellectuals', reprint in: Vlastos (ed.), *The Philosophy of Socrates* (1971), 50–77; Gelzer, *Aristophanes* (1970), 1441–1444; Irwin, *Classical Thought* (1989), 68–70, 232 n. 1

39 *Forschungsbericht* in: Patzer (Hrsg.), *Der historische Sokrates* (1987). Also see Gigon, *Sokrates* (1979); Montuori, *The Socratic Problem* (1992) [cf. my review in: Gnomon 69, 1997, 67–70]; Döring, *Sokrates* (1998), 141–142; Dorion, *The Rise and Fall* (2011), 1–23.

40 Woodbury, *The Date* (1965), 186; Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 377. Janko, in his edition of *PDerv.* (2002), accepted W. Burkert's conjecture τὴν δ[ίνην] (col. XVIII l. 1), but other editions reconstruct the papyrus text quite differently: Jourdan (2003), Tsantsanoglou, Parássoglou (2006), Bernabé (2007). Jourdan, *op. cit.*, 18. 1, even maintains that Janko accepted this conjecture 'pour soutenir sa thèse selon laquelle l'auteur serait Diagoras de Mélos', p.19 n. 1 'Notons ici le circle vicieux qui consiste a restituer un mot pour justifier une interpretation et à le prendre ensuite comme preuve de la justesse de l'interpretation'. Also see Betegh, *op. cit.*, 377–378.

41 Woodbury, *op. cit.*, 206, 209; Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1980), 67, 73; Betegh, *op. cit.*, 376. In chap. III 1, n. 5 are cited those testimonies that consider Diagoras to have been a philosopher.

R. Janko tries to give the impression that he is the first scholar to note that uneducated followers of traditional religion considered philosophers of nature to be atheists who posed a threat to their faith in gods. In fact this problem is well known to the historians of ancient philosophy because an extensive study of this subject was published over a hundred years ago by Wilhelm Capelle (1871–1961).[42] It is indeed a pity that many English language academics ignore the excellent article of that outstanding German scholar.

c. R. Janko attaches great importance to the view Epicurus expressed in the treatise Περὶ φύσεως, book XII, as cited by Philodemus of Gadara in his work Περὶ εὐσεβείας.[43] Epicurus criticised Prodicus, Diagoras and Critias, because they removed deities from things that existed. He also accused them of rearranging the letters in the names of gods. Nevertheless, it should clearly be stated that the part of *PHerc. 1077* which contains the Περὶ εὐσεβείας treatise is badly damaged and scholars have interpreted it very diversely.[44] Although the text used by R. Janko was the edition (based on ancient papyri) of Dirk Obbink, an outstanding Oxford papyrologist, his conjecture not does not have an absolute value. One has to concede that D. Obbink's justification of his variant παραγραμμίζ[ουσι] τὰ τ[ῶ]ν θεῶν [ὀνό]ματα (ll. 533–535) is quite convincing.[45] He notes that already Stesimbrotus of Thasus (5th century BC) interpreted the names of gods by rearranging the letters.[46] Later, Stoics also willingly interpreted *nomina sacra* in this

42 Capelle, *Μετέωρος – μετεωρολογία*, (1912), 414–448. Also see *idem*, *Meteorologie* (1935), 317–319.

43 Epicurus (fr. 87 Usener, fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti[2]) ap. Philod. *De piet*. pars I, col. 19, ll. 519–541 (= p. 112 Gomperz, cf. Diag. T 39 W.) καὶ πᾶσαν μ[ανίαν Ἐ]πίκουρος ἐμ[έμψα]το τοῖς τὸ [θεῖον ἐ]κ τῶν ὄντων [ἀναι]ροῦσιν, ὡς κἀ[ν τῶι] δωδεκάτω[ι Προ]δίκωι καὶ Δια[γόραι] καὶ Κριτίαι κἄ[λλοις] μέμφ[εται] φὰς πα[ρα]κόπτ[ει]ν καὶ μ[αίνεσ]θαι, καὶ βακχεύουσιν αὐτοὺς [εἰ]κά[ζει, κε]λεύ[σας μ]ὴ πρᾶγμα ἡμεῖν παρέχειν οὐδ' ἐνοχλεῖν. κα[ὶ γὰρ] παραγραμμίζ[ουσι] τὰ τ[ῶ]ν θεῶν [ὀνόμα]τα, [κα]θάπερ Ἀν[τισ]θέ[νης] τὸ κοινό[τατον] ὑποτίνων ἀν[αφέρει] τὰ κατὰ μέρος [τῆι θέ]σει καὶ διά τι[νος ἀπά]της ἔτι πρότ[ερον]. Sedley, *Lucretius* (1998), 128–132, believes that Epicurus wrote books I–XIII of Περὶ φύσεως in the years 311/310 – 307/306, when he was still in Lampsacus. Cf. Erler, *Epikur* (1994), 94.

44 See the editions of Hermann Usener (1834–1905), 1887, and Robert Philippson (1858–1942), 1921. NB, Janko rejects the πρᾶγμα variant in the Obbink edition and instead proposes πράγμα[θ'], writing *correxi* in brackets, which suggests that it is his own conjecture. This variant, however, already appeared in the Theodor Gomperz (1832–1912) edition of 1866 and in H. Usener's *Epicurea* of 1887.

45 Obbink, *Philodemus, On Piety* (1996), 358–359.

46 Stesimbr. (FGrHist 107 F 13) ap. *Etym. M*. col. 277, 35 Gaisford Διόνυσος· οἱ μὲν Διόνυξον αὐτὸν ὀνομάζουσιν, ὅτι σὺν κέρασι γεννώμενος ἔνυξε τὸν Διὸς μηρόν, ὡς Στησίμβροτος.

way.[47] Epicurus had a good reason to criticise such an approach to interpreting the names of gods, because in his opinion the names were created in accordance with nature (κατὰ φύσιν).

It should be emphasised that D. Obbink clearly distinguishes between transforming the names of gods by rearranging the letters (παραγραμματίζειν) and etymological allegory using metonymy (e.g. associating Demeter with the earth and Dionysus with wine in Eur. *Bacch*. 274–285).[48] However, R. Janko maintains that the three people criticised by Epicurus applied the allegorical interpretation, i.e. such as appears in *PDerv*. An even more important point is that no ancient testimony supports Epicurus' view that Prodicus, Diagoras and Critias interpreted the names of gods 'by means of rewriting (παραγραμματίζειν)'.[49] In my opinion, a more probable hypothesis is that Epicurus accused Prodicus and Critias of atheism because they said that religion was of human invention. Diagoras, on the other hand, was included in this *index atheorum* because he was the most well-known atheist of that period.

Having read several articles by R. Janko, I am coming to the conclusion that he is deeply convinced in the truth of his hypothesis and that is why he *a priori* rejects all criticism of his stance. He is totally unimpressed by the fact that not a single *PDerv.* scholar has accepted his hypothesis. Some have rejected it outright, while others have found it unconvincing.[50] I am of the opinion that we will never know the name of the author of the commentary to the Orphic theogony in *PDerv*., and every proposed hypothesis will be of a

47 Philod. *PHerc. 1428* col. VIII 9–11 p. 18 Henrichs καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν [ὀ]νόματα ἐφαρμόττει; col. IX 27–29 p. 20 Henrichs καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν μὲν οἷον Ἀθ[ρ]ηνᾶν εἰρῆσθαι; Cic. *Nat. deor*. III 62 'quamquam, quoniam Neptunum a nando appellatum putas, nullum erit nomen quod non possis una littera explicare unde ductum sit'; cf. Cic. *Nat. deor*. II 66.

48 Obbink, *op. cit*., 359.

49 Obbink, *loc. cit*.

50 Egli, *Euripides* (2003), 145 n. 3, 'Seine Hypothesen … scheinen mir unbeweisbar, ja die Frage nach dem Autor überhaupt unergiebig'; Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus* (2004), 373–380; Burkert, *Die altorphische Theogonie* (2006), 96, prefers his own hypothesis, according to which the author is Stesimbrotus; Graf, Johnston, *Ritual Texts* (2007), 'None are convincing'; Bremmer, *Persian Magoi* (2008), 245 n. 52 'whose own suggestion, Diagoras, is hardly more persuasive'; Edmonds, *Extra-Ordinary People* (2008), 32 n. 70; *idem*, *Redefining Ancient Orphism* (2013), 130–131, rejects Janko's opinion that Diagoras was an antireligious thinker who tried to destroy religious tradition. Only Broggiato, *Giovanni Lido* (2002), 231–237, is inclined to accept Janko's hypothesis. She introduces the name of Diagoras to the damaged text of *De mensibus* IV 71, by John Lydus. However, this amendment does not seem very convincing to me.

subjective nature.[51] That is why I believe it is better to come to terms with this fact rather than insist on a hypothesis which can never be verified.

51 Bernabé, *La théogonie orphique* (2002), 97 'l'un des derniers présocratiques, quoique ce soit très difficile, voire impossible, d'établir son identité'; Jourdan, *Le Papyrus* (2003), XXIV, 'Rechercher l'identité de l'auteur ne présente pas une importance capital. La volonté de l'indentifier à tel ou tel dont on aurait reconnu la doctrine risquerait d'infléchir la comprehension du texte dans des directions qui ne sont pas les siennes'; Kouremenos, *Introduction* (2006), 59, 'attempting to identify the author in the light of the available evidence seems to be an exercise of rather low epistemic value'.

VI. Conclusions

Diagoras, the son of Teleclytus or Telecleides, was born on the island of Melos in the first half of the 5th century BC. Later he began the life of an itinerant poet who took commissions to write dithyrambs, encomia, paeans and perhaps also epinikia. For a time he was active in various cities of the Peloponnese. Particularly important was his stay in Mantinea, where he befriended the boxer Nicodorus. Probably in the 430s he arrived in Athens, which was then a very important centre of culture. It appears that he failed to achieve any literary successes there but he did become known for his criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries, and this brought him notoriety as an impious person. An allusion to his impiety is found in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (v. 830 Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος), which were performed during the City Dionysia of 423. By then Diagoras was no longer in Athens, because around the year 425 he moved to Mantinea, where his friend Nicodorus was entrusted with the mission of drafting a constitution. The democratic constitution of Mantinea was later praised by ancient authors, such as Aristotle and Polybius. Diagoras wrote a poem, Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον, especially for the enactment of this constitution. During his stay in Mantinea, he also wrote two other poems, one devoted to Nicodorus, the other to Arianthes of Argos. The city of Argos had maintained a close relationship with Mantinea since 420, when it joined an alliance (together with Athens and Elis) against Sparta. When in 418 the armies of the anti-Spartan coalition was defeated in the Battle of Mantinea, Diagoras, being a friend of Nicodorus, had to leave the city and most probably returned to Athens. He was also in Athens during the siege and capture of Melos in 416/415. But it was in 415/414 that Diagoras started facing a great danger. On the night before the Athenian fleet set sail for Sicily, unknown perpetrators mutilated the city's Herms and rumours were spread about the parodying of the Eleusinian Mysteries by Alcibiades. Widespread outrage at such sacrilege, combined with the obsessive fear of an oligarchic coup d'état, resulted in a frenetic search for the hermokopids and those responsible for the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries. Quite innocent people were denounced, arrested and subsequently executed. In this situation Diagoras could not expect to avoid the charge of impiety, since some people must have remembered his earlier remarks about the Eleusinian Mysteries. Diagoras fully realised that the only thing that could save him was to flee from Athens posthaste. That is why he fled to the Achaean city of Pellene in the Peloponnese. From the very start of the Peloponnesian War this polis had stood on the side of Sparta and was very hostile towards Athens, also in the later period. The Athenians responded by charging Diagoras with impiety *in absentia*. When the citizens of Pellene refused to allow for him to be extradited, the People's Assembly passed a decree which awarded one talent of silver for Diagoras' murder and two talents

for his capture. This decree was in force throughout the territories of the Delian League. We do not know how long Diagoras remained in Pellene and in which city he died, though it is probable that he died before the end of the 5th century BC.

The ancient tradition ascribes the titles of two prose works to Diagoras, Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι and Φρύγιοι λόγοι. So far the dominant view has been that the two titles refer to the same work, which could be authentic or apocryphal. I have nevertheless tried to show that the Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι were written by a sophist in the first half of the 4th century BC. This work was soon forgotten, but people persistently believed that Diagoras was the author of an atheistic book. That is why in the Hellenistic period a book entitled Φρύγιοι λόγοι was published under his name. It most probably propagated euhemeristic ideas, which many pagans and Christians considered impious or even atheistic. Diagoras was still considered the author of one book, but now it was a completely different book. In the Roman Empire period, Tatian and Porphyry (on whom the Arab writer Al-Mubaššir indirectly relied) had heard only of Φρύγιοι λόγοι. The only extant source to mention Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι is the *Suda*, whose author must have relied on a more ancient source passed on by Hesychius of Miletus. It should be stressed that we do not know what arguments were used by the authors of these books, while various attempts to reconstruct their contents are of a subjective and unverifiable nature. Quite unconvincing for me is the view held by R. Janko whereby Diagoras was the author of an allegorical commentary to the Orphic theogony in *PDerv*. Totally erroneous should also be considered the hypotheses of scholars who have tried to prove that the poetry or prose of Diagoras had had any influence on the comedies of Aristophanes, the tragedies of Euripides, the satyr drama Σίσυφος by Critias or the writings of Epicureans.

Almost all the ancient sources present Diagoras as a typical atheist who denied the existence of gods, and for this reason he was included in the catalogues of atheists. This is why many scholars are of the opinion that Diagoras really was an atheist. It is a view that was popularised by Felix Jacoby, who considered Diagoras to be the first radical atheist in antiquity. Such scholars, however, fail to take into account the fact that it is not the quantity of testimonies, but their quality which is most important. Catalogues of atheists occur predominantly in the works of authors living in the Roman Empire period (chiefly doxographers and the Church Fathers), i.e. five or even seven to eight centuries after Diagoras. The earliest known testimony is Cicero's treatise *De natura deorum* (1st century BC). It is therefore obvious that these authors had acquired their information from secondary sources and repeated it uncritically. Moreover, living in a period so distant to that of Diagoras they most probably did not even have the means to verify information passed on by earlier authors. In my opinion, a large proportion

of the catalogues of atheists relied on a list of atheists drawn up in the 2nd century BC by Clitomachus of Carthage, a scholarch of the Platonic Academy in the years 127/126 – 110/109. We may also note that some Christian authors relied on each other, e.g. Arnobius (T 63) relied on Clement of Alexandria (T 62), and Epiphanius (T 28) probably also relied on Clement of Alexandria. Therefore, scholars who cite a number of testimonies of works written in the Roman Empire period or Cicero's *De natura deorum* treatise in an attempt to prove the radical atheism of Diagoras are making a serious methodological mistake.

At the start of the 4th century BC, Pseudo-Lysias (T 16) considered Diagoras to have been an impious person. This tradition was also known to the Peripatetic Aristoxenus of Tarentum (T 69), who conducted research for his history of music in Mantinea in the 4th century BC. But he considered this tradition to be false, because in Mantinea he had found some of Diagoras' pious poems. This contradiction (the pious poetry versus the atheistic book) was noticed by other ancient authors. This is why an anecdote was invented (we know two variants) to explain how a pious poet turned into an atheist. Next, Diagoras' attitude towards the gods was criticised by Epicurus (T 39) in his most important work Περὶ φύσεως at the end of the 4th century BC. It actually includes the earliest known *index atheorum*, (Prodicus, Diagoras, Critias), although it was not referred to by later authors. The Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara (1st century BC), on the other hand, considered the Stoics to be more impious than Diagoras and he downplayed his alleged atheism, assuming that the Melian author was only joking when he wrote about the gods (T 69).

It seems to me that scholars make another methodological error when they ask themselves the general question as to whether or not Diagoras was an atheist. Here two problems need to be clearly distinguished: 1) whether or not the ancient authors were right to consider Diagoras an atheist, 2) whether or not Diagoras could be considered a radical atheist today. These are two completely separate questions and the answer to one does not have to be the same as the answer to the other. Clitomachus was fully entitled to include Diagoras among known atheists because he considered him the author of an atheistic book who had criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries and revealed their secrets. He also knew that Diagoras had escaped from Athens in 415/414 to avoid being accused of impiety. Moreover, there were three anecdotes illustrating Diagoras' critical attitude towards the gods, though these had actually emerged in the Hellenistic period. We should, nevertheless, remember that the concept of impiety (ἀσέβεια) included various transgressions that had nothing to do with denying the existence of gods. Likewise the term ἄθεος initially did not mean atheist *per se*, but rather someone who was *godless*, *immoral, heinous* or, more rarely, *abandoned by the gods*. It was not

until Plato's *Apology* (26 C) that the term ἄθεος actually meant *atheist*. But later authors of the same period continued to apply different meanings to the term, which is why each time the intended sense of the term has to be determined. It is worth adding that Jews and Christians were also called atheists, and Christians, in turn, pressed this charge not only against pagans, but also against heretics of their own religion. In my opinion, atheism perceived as 'the negation of the existence of any kind of deity or supernatural forces' did not emerge in Greece until around the year 400 BC. This happened due to four factors: 1) criticism of the anthropomorphism and immorality of the Olympian gods, which was begun by Xenophanes of Colophon in the 6th century, 2) rationalistic criticism of myths, which was first applied by Hecataeus of Miletus, c. 500 3) the materialist and mechanistic concept of the formation of the world as well as natural explanations for natural phenomena which appear in Presocratic philosophy, and 4) considering religion to be of human invention in the second half of the 5th century (the theories of Prodicus of Ceos, Democritus of Abdera and Critias of Athens). I do not believe we can absolutize any of these factors and consider one of them to be the most important. Only when they were all present, which occurred towards the end of the 5th century BC, was the atmosphere right for the emergence of the first radical atheists. One cannot rule out that the plague that persisted in Athens for a long time during the Peloponnesian War inclined some of the inhabitants to deny the existence of the gods. This could have happened because they saw not only bad and impious people die, but also those who were pious and good, whereas the plague was traditionally explained as divine punishment.

In my opinion, Diagoras was not a radical atheist, because the atheistic book ascribed to him was apocryphal, and likewise the story of the pious poet converting to atheism was the invention of Hellenistic biographers. Also originating from the Hellenistic period are the three anecdotes supposedly testifying Diagoras' critical attitude towards the gods. In the first he throws a statue of Heracles into a fire to cook himself a meal. The second anecdote includes Diagoras' words uttered during a storm, whereas in the third he speaks critically about votive offerings submitted in the Cabeiri sanctuary on Samothrace. The latter two anecdotes suggest that Diagoras did not believe in divine providence. However, the only certain fact in Diagoras' life is that he criticised the Eleusinian Mysteries and revealed their secrets. There is no evidence to support the view that Diagoras' 'atheism' had any philosophical basis. Some scholars have overestimated the importance of Diagoras in history by regarding him to be one of the leaders of progressive thought in Athens, alongside Anaxagoras and Socrates (E.R. Dodds, R. Janko). It is also doubtful that he moved in the 'enlightened circles of Athens' or that he participated in parodying the Eleusinian mysteries at the house of Alcibiades (W. Nestle). No more convincing is the hypothesis that sees Diagoras

as 'the literary initiator of the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries' (Wilhelm Schmid). More probable is the view the Diagoras was linked with dithyrambic poets (e.g. Cinesias) who ridiculed the gods and religious ceremonies in Athens (L. Woodbury). An assumption that seems most apt is that Diagoras' stance was a manifestation of the general decline in cult piety (*Kultfrömmigkeit*) which took place towards the end of the 5th century BC (F. Wehrli).

Appendix I
Diagoras as an Impious Person and Atheist

1. Aristophanes
   Nub. 827–828, 830 (T 38 W.)
   See chap. II 2 A

2. Pseudo-Lysias
   C. Andoc. (or. 6) 17 (T 16 W.)
   See chap. II 3

3. Epicurus
   Περὶ φύσεως XII (fr. 87 Usener, fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti[2]) ap. Philod. De piet. I 19, 523–536 Obbink (T 39 W.)
   Catalogue of atheists: Prodicus, Diagoras, Critias

4. Cicero
   A. De nat. deor. I 2 (T 40 W.)
      Catalogue of atheists: Protagoras, Diagoras, Theodorus
   B. De nat. deor. I 63 (T 41 W.)
      "Quid Diagoras, Atheos qui dictus est, posteaque Theodorus none aperte deorum naturam sustulerunt?"
   C. De nat. deor. I 117 (T 42 W.)
      Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Protagoras
   D. De nat. deor. III 89 (T 36 W.)
      "Diagoras [...] Atheus ille qui dicitur"

5. Philodemus
   PHerc. 1428 col. XI–XII 12 ed. Henrichs (T 69 W.)
   See chap. II 4

6. Diodorus Siculus
   Bibl. hist. XIII 6, 7 (T 17 W.)
   ἄθεος // διαβολῆς τυχὼν ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ

7. Plutarchus
   A. De comm. not. 31, 1075 A (T 53 W.)
      Catalogue of atheists: Theodorus, Diagoras, Hippo
   B. De superst. 13, 171 BC (T 14 W.)
      For the Carthaginians it would be better to take Diagoras as a lawmaker than offer bloody sacrifices to Cronus.

8. Aëtius
   A. Plac. I 7, 1 p. 297 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. I 7, 880 D (T 47 W.)
      Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus

B. Ps.-Plut. Kitāb al-ārāʾ al-ṭabīʿ ya I 7, p. 114–115 Daiber (Arab version with German translation).
See chap. II 8 C

9. Aelius Aristides
Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 258 (Or. 2 Behr = II 80 Dindorf) [T 54 W.]

10. Maximus Tyrius
Dissert. 11, 5 (T 55 W.)
κἂν μὴ εἶναι φῇς (scil. τὸ θεῖον), ὡς Διαγόρας

11. Athenagoras
Leg. pro Chr. 4 (T 27 W.)
Διαγόρᾳ [....] ἀθεότητα ἐπεκάλουν [....] ἄντικρυς δὲ ἀποφαινομένῳ μηδὲ ὅλως εἶναι θεόν

12. Galenus
De usu partium XII 6 (II 196 Helmreich = IV 21 Kühn)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Anaxagoras, Epicurus

13. Sextus Empiricus
A. Pyrrh. hyp. III 218 (T 56 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Critias
B. Adv. math. IX 50–53 (T 57 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Euhemerus, Diagoras, Prodicus, Theodorus

14. Clemens Alexandrinus
Protr. II 24, 2 (T 63 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Euhemerus, Nicanor of Cyprus, Diagoras, Hippo, Theodorus

15. Aelianus
A. Var. hist. II 23 (T 13 W.)
θεοῖς ἐχθρός
B. Var. hist. II 31 (T 60 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Euhemerus, Diogenes of Phrygia, Hippo, Diagoras, Sosias, Epicurus
C. Nat. anim. VI 40 (T 58 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Hippo, Diagoras, Herostratus
D. Fr. 33 Hercher = fr. 36 Domingo- Forasté (T 59 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Xenophanes, Diagoras, Hippo, Epicurus

16. Diogenes Oenoandensis,
Fr. 16 Smith (T 62 W.)
Diagoras and Protagoras are charged with atheism by the Epicurean.

17. Minucius Felix
Oct. 8, 2 (T 43 W.)

'Sit licet ille Theodorus Cyrenaeus, vel qui prior Diagoras Melius, cui Atheon cognomen adposuit antiquitas, qui uterque nullos deos adseverando timorem omnem, quo humanitas regitur, venerationemque penitus sustulerunt.'

18. Arnobius
Adv. nat. IV 29 (T 64 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Euhemerus, Nicagoras of Cyprus, Leon of Pella, Theodorus, Hippo, Diagoras

19. Lactantius
A. Div. inst. I 2, 2 (T 44 W.)
'Diagoras, qui exclusit (scil. deos)'
B. De ira Dei 9, 7 (T 45 W.)
'extitit Melius quidam Diagoras qui nullum esse omnino deum diceret, ob eamque sententiam nominatus est atheus'

20. Eusebius
A. Praep. ev. XIV 16, 1 (T 47 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus
B. Hier. Chron. p. 110, 4 Helm (T 5 A W.)
"Diagoras atheus"
C. Chron. versio Arm. p. 192 Karst (T 5 B W.)

21. Libanius
A. Apol. Socr. 153 (V 102 Förster) [T 23 W.]
Catalogue of atheists: Anaxagoras, Protagoras, Diagoras
B. Apol. Socr. 154 (V 103 Förster) [T 19 W.]
Catalogue of atheists: Anaxagoras, Protagoras, Diagoras

22. Ioannes Chrysostomus
In ep. 1 ad Cor. hom. 4, 5 (PG 61, col. 36–37) [T 24 W.]
Catalogue of atheists: Protagoras, Diagoras, Theodorus

23. Augustinus
Contra litt. Petiliani III 21, 25 (CSEL 52, 182) [T 87 A W.]
'atheus Diagoras, qui esse deum negavit'
The manuscripts transmit, however, the variant 'atheus Protagoras'. See critical apparatus to T 87 W.

24. Theodoretus
A. Graec. affect. cur., praef. 9 (T 50 W.)
Διαγόρου μὲν τὸ ἄθεον
B. Graec. affect. cur. II 112 (T 48 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus
C. Gr. affect. cur. III 4 (T 49 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus

D. Gr. affect. cur. VI 6 (T 51 W.)
τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Διαγόραν φασὶν ἀθέους ἐπίκλην ὀνομασθῆναι διὰ τὸ πάμπαν ἀρνηθῆναι τὸ θεῖον.

25. Pseudo-Galenus
Hist. philos. 35 p. 617–618 Diels (T 52 W.)
Catalogue of atheists: Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus

26. Simplicius
In Arist. De caelo I 3 p. 116, 22–26 Heiberg (T 66 W.)
The followers of Hippo and Diagoras deny the existence of the gods.

27. Scholia in Aristophanis Nubes 830 a-g (T 6 A W.)
θεομάχος // εἰς ἀθείαν ἐτράπη // ἀσεβέστατος ἐκρίθη // ἐπὶ τὸ ἄθεος εἶναι ἔδραμεν // βλάσφημος ἐπὶ τὸ θεῖον.

28. Scholia in Aristophanis Aves 1073 (T 7 A W.)
ἐκηρύχθη δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τὸ ἀσεβὲς αὐτοῦ.

29. Scholia in Aristophanis Ranas 320 (T 8 W.)
ἄθεος

30. Scholia in Clementis Alexandrini Protr. II 24, 2 (I 304 Stählin) [T 26 W.]
εἰς ἀθεότητα ἐτράπη

31. Suda
A. s.v. Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους (I 315 Adler) [T 67 A W.]
Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, οὓς ἔγραψε Διαγόρας ὁ Ἄθεος, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης.
B. s.v. Διαγόρας 523 (II 53 Adler) [T 9 A W.]
Ἄθεος // ἔγραψε τοὺς καλουμένους Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης.
C. s.v. Διαγόρας 524 (II 53 Adler) [T 7 B W.]
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθέων καὶ ἀπίστων καὶ ἀσεβῶν // ἐκηρύχθη δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τὸ ἀσεβὲς αὐτοῦ.
D. s.v. ἔρρε (II 404 Adler) [T 59 W.]
θεοῖς ἐχθρός
E. s.v. Ἴακχος (II 602 Adler) [T 86 W.]
ἄθεος
F. s.v. πυργίσκοι (IV 274 Adler) [T 67 B]
ἔγραψε τοὺς καλουμένους Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης.
G. s.v. Σωκράτης (IV 405 Adler) [T 6 B W.]
θεομάχος // ἐπὶ τὸ ἄθεος εἶναι ἔδραμεν // ἀσεβέστατος ἐκρίθη

32. Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik
Muḫtār al-ḥikam wa maḥāsin al kalim p. 30–31 Rosenthal (T 10 W., Latin version)
Diagoras impius (Ḏiyaġūrās al-māriq) // cum autem in sacrilegio (nifāq), impietate (kufr) et maledicto in deum (taʿṭīl) permaneret.

33. Pseudo-Hesychius
De viris illustr. 17 (T 9 B W.)
ἄθεος // ἔγραψε τοὺς Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης.

34. Ioannes Tzetzes
A. Comment. in Arist. Nub. 829 a (T 11 W.)
εἰς ἐσχάτην ἐτράπη ἀσέβειαν
B. Comment. in Arist. Nub. 830 a (T 76 W.)
ἄθεος
C. Comment. in Arist. Ran. 320 a (T 12 W.)
ἄθεος
D. Comment. in Arist. Ran. 320 b (T 74 W.)
ἄθεος
E. Chiliad. XIII 375
ἄθεος

35. Eustathius
A. Comment. ad Hom. Odyss. III 381 (T 61 W.)
ἄθεος
B. Comment. in Dion. Perieg. 530 (GGM II 320) [T 73 W.]
ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ κωμῳδούμενος

36. Michael Apostolius
Paroemiae VI 4 (CPG II 365) [T 78 W.]
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθέων καὶ ἀπίστων

37. Arsenius
Violetum p. 180 Walz (T 78 W.)
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθέων καὶ ἀπίστων

38. Pseudo-Eudocia
Violarium 328 p. 237–238 Flach
ἄθεος

Appendix II
Contra Deos Testimonium

1. Theognis
   A. Elegi 377–380
      Zeus allows good and bad people to meet the same fate.
   B. Elegi 743–752
      It is difficult to worship the gods when one sees good people suffer misfortunes.

2. Euripides
   A. Hippol. 1102–1110
      The chorus complains that in the lives of people one cannot see the actions of the gods, because everything happens by chance.
   B. Bellerophontes, fr. 286 Kannicht (TrGF V 354)
      Good and pious people fare badly, while wicked people live happily.
   C. Hippolytus I, fr. 434 Kannicht (TrGF V 469)
      Success in life is achieved through bold deeds, not thanks to piety.
   D. Phrixus, fr. 832 Kannicht (TrGF V 873)
      It is not fair that a pious person encounters the same fate as an impious person.
   E. Skyrioi, fr. 684 Kannicht (TrGF V 669)
      Good and pious people encounter misfortune in life.
   F. Fr. 900 Kannicht (TrGF V 910)
      If Zeus is in heaven, misfortune should not befall a good person.

3. Tragici Graeci incerti
   A. Fr. 1 b (g), ll. 15–24 Snell-Kannicht (TrGF II 5–6) ap. Stob. IV 42, 7 (V 951–952 Hense)
      Impious people fare well and the virtuous fare badly. The gods should reward the pious and punish the impious.
   B. Fr. 465 Snell-Kannicht (TrGF II 137)
      Τολμῶ κατειπεῖν, μήποτ' οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί·
      κακοὶ γὰρ εὐτυχοῦντες ἐκπλήσσουσί με.

4. Thrasymachus Chalcedonius
   DK 85 B 8 ap. Herm. In Pl. Phaedr. 267 C schol. p. 239 Couvreur
   The gods do not look after people, because in the world the rule of justice is not respected.

5. Diagoras Melius
   A. T 6 A Winiarczyk ap. Schol. Arist. Nub. 830 b et 830 f
   B. T 6 B W. ap. Sudam s.v. Σωκράτης (IV 405 Adler)
   C. T 9 A W. ap. Sudam s.v. Διαγόρας (II 53 Adler).
   D. T 9 B W. ap. Ps.-Hesych. Mil. De viris illustr. 17
   E. T 11 W. ap. Ioh. Tzetzes, Comment. Arist. Nub. 829 a
   F. T 26 W. ap. Schol. Clem. Alex. II 24, 2 (I 304 Stählin)
   G. T 57 W. ap. Sext. Emp. Adv. math. IX 53

6. Thucydides
   Bell. Pelop. II 53
   People stopped worshiping the gods during the plague in Athens because not only the bad, but also the good and pious died.

7. Aristophanes
   Nubes 398–402
   Zeus does not throw thunderbolts at perjurers, but they do strike temples and tall oaks.

8. Diogenes Sinopensis
   A. Fr. V B 335 Giannantoni (SSR II 360) ap. Cic. Nat. deor. III 83
      'Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere solebat Harpalum, qui temporibus illis praedo felix habebatur, contra deos testimonium dicere, quod in illa fortuna tam diu viveret.'
   B. Fr. V B 335 G. (SSR II 360) ap. Cic. Nat. deor. III 88
      'improborum igitur prosperitates secundaeque res redarguunt, ut Diogenes dicebat, vim omnem deorum ac potestatem.'

9. Epicurus
   Fr. 370 Usener ap. Lact. Div. inst. III 17, 8
   'videbat Epicurus bonis adversa semper accidere, paupertatem labores exilia carorum amissiones, malos contra beatos esse, augeri potentia, honoribus adfici.'

10. Menander
    A. Colax 27–28
       The gods support villains because the virtuous do not fare well.
    B. Epitrepontes 1084–1099
       The gods do not have time to apportion to people goodness and evil because there are too many cities.
    C. Sent. 338
       Θεῶν ὄνειδος τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

11. Cercidas Megapolitanus
    Fr. 1 Diehl = fr. 1 Lomiento
    People have doubts as to whether the gods look after them, because the bad are successful.

12. Ennius
    Telamon (Scaen. fr. 316–318 Vahlen = fr. CXXXIV Jocelyn = fr. 117 Manuwald [TrRF II 240–245])
    'Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum,
    sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus;
    nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis, quod nunc abest.'

13. Accius
    Fr. 142–143 Ribbeck$^{2-3}$
    'iam neque di regunt // nec profecto deum supremus rex <res> curat hominibus'

14. Pseudo-Varro
    Epigramma, p. 265 Riese
    'Marmoreo Licinus tumulo iacet, at Cato parvo,
    Pompeius nullo: credimus esse deos?'

15. Lucretius
    A. De rer. nat. II 1101–1104
       Lightning spares the villains and strikes the innocent.
    B. De rer. nat. VI 417–420
       Lightning strikes temples and the images of the gods.

16. Cicero
    A. De nat. deor. III 79–80
       Providence does not exist because many virtuous people have been unjustly killed.
    B. De nat. deor. III 81
       'Dies deficiat si velim numerare quibus bonis male evenerit, nec minus si commemorem quibus improbis optime.'
    C. De nat. deor. III 82
       The deaths of Anaxarchus, Zeno of Elea and Socrates show that providence does not exist.
    D. De nat. deor. III 83
       Dionysius the Elder sailed safely to Syracuse after looting the temple of Proserpine in Epizephyrian Locris, in southern Italy.

17. Ovidius
    A. Amores III 3, 1–2
       'Esse deos, i, crede: fidem iurata fefellit,
       Et facies illi quae fuit ante manet.'
    B. Amores III 9, 35–36
       'Cum rapiant mala fata bonos, (ignoscite fasso)
       Sollicitor nullos esse putare deos.'
    C. Metam. IX 203–204
       'At valet Eurystheus ! et sunt, qui credere possint
       Esse deos?' (Words spoken by Heracles on mount Oeta)

18. Philo Alexandrinus
    A. De prov. I 37
       Misfortunes beset good and bad people alike. Sometimes honest people live in poverty and bad people live well.
    B. De prov. II 3
       'Tune solus nescius es, quod malis et sceleratis copiose bona omnia adfluunt, divitiae, optima fama, honores, multiplex principatus ... Qui vero consilii, sapientiae et omnis virtutis studiosi atque amantes sunt, universi fere pauperes sunt, egentes, inglorii, humiles.'
    C. Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat 34

Virtuous people live in poverty, they are treated with contempt and tormented by diseases, whereas egoists are wealthy, famous and enjoy good health

19. Seneca
    A. Consol. ad Marciam 12, 6
    'nec odia hominum veritus ... nec invidiam deorum, quorum illud crimen erat, Sulla tam felix.'
    B. Ep. 74, 10
    'primum male de providentia iudicat, quia multa incommoda iustis viris accidunt.'
    C. De providentia
    The dialogue considers the problem 'Quare aliqua incommoda bonis viris accidant, cum providentia sit.'

20. Lucanus
    De bello civ. (Pharsalia) VII 445–447
    'Sunt nobis nulla profecto
    numina; cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu,
    mentimur regnare Iovem.'

21. Quintilianus
    Inst. Orat. VI, praef. 4–9
    The author condemns the gods first for the death of his young mother and later for the death of his several years old son.

22. Aëtius
    Plac. I 7, 10 p. 301 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. I 7 p. 881 D
    If there was a god who controlled human affairs, the bad would not be successful and the good would not encounter misfortunes.

23. Plutarchus
    De stoic. rep. 37, 1051 CD (= SVF II 1178)
    The sentencing to death of virtuous people, such as Socrates and Zeno of Elea, proves the lack of providence.

24. Epictetus
    A. Dissert. I 22, 15
    The misfortunes and defeats suffered by man is testimony that Zeus does not care about mankind.
    B. Dissert. I 27, 13
    People blame Zeus and the other gods for not being able to achieve their plans.
    C. Dissert. III 15, 14
    The murder of Emperor Galba contradicts the existence of providence.
    D. Fr. 13 Schenkl ap. Stob. Anthol. I 3, 50 (I 61–62 Wachsmuth)
    Virtuous people encounter misfortune in life, while bad people have fortunate lives.

25. Lucianus
    A. Iupp. conf. 9
       Cyniscus questions the existence of providence, because perpetrators of sacrilege go unpunished.
    B. Iupp. conf. 16
       The lighting of Zeus does not strike perjurers and villains, but instead temples and oaks, and sometimes the virtuous and pious traveller.
    C. Iupp. conf. 17
       Bad and insolent people live happily, whereas the virtuous suffer poverty and diseases.
    D. Iupp. trag. 19–20
       The happy lives of rogues and the misfortunes of the virtuous is evidence that the gods do not exist.
    E. Iupp. trag. 37
       Providence does not exist because the gods do not punish perjurers.

26. Athenagoras
    De resur. 18
    Many impious and immoral people lead happy lives until they die, whereas the virtuous lead lives full of suffering and various kinds of misfortunes. That is why there must follow a resurrection of bodies after which every person is rewarded or punished for their deeds.

27. Griechische Grabgedichte no. 288, 5–6 Peek
    Virtuous people die before their time, while the bad live long.

28. Minucius Felix
    A. Octavius 5, 10
       Lightning strikes the bad and the pious indiscriminately. At sea, in fires and plagues both the virtuous and villainous perish.
    B. Octavius 5, 12
       'quodsi mundus divina providentia et alicuius numinis auctoritate regeretur, numquam mereretur Phalaris et Dionysius regnum, numquam Rutilius et Camillus exilium, numquam Socrates venenum.'
    C. Octavius 12,2
       'Ecce pars vestrum, et maior melior, ut dicitis, egetis algetis, opere fame laboratis, et deus patitur dissimulat, non vult aut non potest opitulari suis; ita aut invalidus aut iniquus est.' (Argument posed by the pagan Caecilius).

29. Sextus Empiricus
    Pyrrh. hyp. I 32
    The lack of providence is evidenced by the misfortunes of the virtuous and successes of the bad.

30. Pseudo-Clemens Romanus
    A. Recognitiones III 40, 1

'Nonnulli hominum blasphemantes deum et omnem vitam suam in iniustitia et voluptate ducentes, in lectulis suis defuncti sunt, consecuti finem vitae inter suos et honorabilem sepulturam.'

B. Recogn. IX 13, 1
'Multi et homicidium et adulterium et alia scelera commiserunt, et nihil mali passi sunt.'

31. Lactantius
A. Div. inst. III 17, 9
'Maxime autem commovebat homines in primis religiosos gravioribus malis adfici, his autem, qui aut deos omnino neglegerent aut ne pie colerent, vel minora incommoda evenire vel nulla.'
B. Div. inst. V 10, 12
'Et locum invenit Epicuri philosophia nihil ad deos pertinere censentis nec gratia eos tangi nec ira moveri, quia et contemptores eorum saepe videant beatos et cultores saepe miseros.'

32. Eusebius
Praep. ev. VIII 14, 3
Bad people do well for themselves, and just people suffer misfortunes.

33. Himerius
A. Or. 3, 17 ap. Phot. Bibl. 243 p. 357 a 23–25 (VI 67–68 Henry)
Epicurus argued that bad people fare well.
B. Or. 3, 19 ap. Phot. Bibl. 243 p. 357 b 11–12 (VI 68 Henry)
Epicurus accused providence of not apportioning justice according to merit.

34. Claudianus
In Rufinum I 12–15
'Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Aspicerem laetosque diu florere nocentes
Vexarique pios, rursus labefacta cadebat
religio.'

35. Hieronymus
Epist. 39, 2, 3 (CSEL 54, 296)
Why do innocent and sinless children die, while impious people live long a happy lives?

36. Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis I 35 Jäkel
κακοὶ γὰρ εὐτυχοῦντες ἐκπλήσσουσί με.

37. Olympiodorus
In Platonis Gorgiam 17, 2 p. 97 Westerink
Greek text in: 3 b.

38. Simplicius
In Epicteti enchiridion 38 p. 368 Hadot
Greek text in: 3 b.

39. Apostolius
Prov. VIII 89 D (CPG II 456)
Θεοῦ δ' ὄνειδος τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

40. Arsenius
Violetum p. 298 Walz
Greek text in: 36.

Cf. Job 21, 7–16; Jer. 12, 1–3; Prov. 24, 19–20; Ps. 37 (36), 49 (48), 73 (72).

Appendix III
Gods Punish Those Who Stay With an Impious Person

1. Homerus
   A. Il. I 8–52
      When Agamemnon insulted Chryses, a priest of Apollo, the god sent a plague on all the Greeks outside Troy.
   B. Il. I 408–410
      Achilles prays to Thetis to ask Zeus for other Achaeans to be punished with death for the misdeed of their leader Agamemnon.
   C. Il. XVI 384–392
      Zeus sent a downpour on the people because the judges on the agora passed unjust sentences.
   D. Il. XXIV 602–617
      The hubris of Niobe made Apollo and Artemis kill all her children and Zeus turn into stone all her subjects.
   E. Od. III 133–134
      Many ships sank during the storm because not all the Greeks were righteous and this provoked the wrath of Athena. The goddess was outraged that the Greeks had not punished Ajax, the son of Oileus, who had been impious and assaulted her priestess Cassandra.
   F. Od. XII 377–419
      Zeus destroyed with lightning Odysseus's ship because his companions had committed an act of impiety by killing and eating oxen dedicated to Helios on the island of Trinacria.

2. Hesiodus
   A. Op. 240–241
      Πόλλακι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀπηύρα,
      ὅστις ἀλιτραίνει καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάαται.
   B. Fr. 30, 15–19 Merkelbach-West
      The gods punished the impious king Salmoneus and all his people.

3. Bias
   ap. Diog. Laert. I 86 = Gnom. Vat. 148 = Flor. Mon. 169 = Ps.-Maxim. Conf. Loci communes 14, 29/28 p. 354 Ihm = Arsen. Violetum p. 148 Walz
   When impious people invoked the gods during a sea storm, Bias said it would be better if the gods had not seen them.

4. Aeschylus
   A. Suppl. 616–620
      The king of the Pelasgians said in Argos that rejection of the plea of the supplicants (Danaus and his daughters) would draw the wrath of Zeus Hikesios on the whole polis.

B. Septem 602–604
A pious person dies when on the ship also sail wicked people.

5. Pindarus
Pyth. 3, 35–37
Together with Coronis, who was unfaithful to Apollo, her neighbours also suffered death.

6. Sophocles
A. Ant. 370–375
The chorus do not wish for someone who proceeds badly to sit next to them by the fire.
B. Oed. Rex 95–146
Oedipus, who unwittingly killed Laius, brought the plague on the inhabitants of Thebes.
C. Oed. Rex 236–275
Oedipus forbade all the inhabitants of Thebes to have any contacts with the murderer of Laius because that would draw misfortune on the entire city.

7. Euripides
A. El. 1354–1355
The Dioscuri say one should not sail with perjurers.
B. Fr. 852, 3–5 Kannicht (TrGF V 887)
You should not sail in a ship with someone who does not respect his parents.

8. Diagoras Melius
A. T 34 Winiarczyk ap. Cic. Nat. deor. III 89
B. T 35 A W. ap. Flor. Ἄριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα 38 = Corp. Par. 6, 65 = Flor. Mon. 190 = Flor. Leid. 179
C. T 35 B W. ap. Gnomica Basil. 156 = Cod. Leid. Voss. 68 p. 29 adn. 2 Beynen.

9. Antiphon
A. Tetr. I 1, 10–11
A man with miasma deprives the temenos of ritual purity and passes the miasma on to other participants of the symposium, which causes the inhabitants of the polis to suffer crop failure and other misfortunes.
B. Or. 5, 82
Pious people perished at sea because they sailed on a ship where there were passengers bearing the miasma.

10. Xenophon Atheniensis
A. Cyrop. VIII 1, 25
One should sail with pious people.
B. Hieron 4, 4
A person maintaining contacts with a murderer is infected by the miasma.

11. Plato
A. Leg. IX, 868 AB

A murderer who is not purged sullies with his presence the agora, the games and other sacred places, and is therefore a threat to all citizens.

B. Leg. IX, 871 A
The law prohibits murderers from coming to the port, because their presence spreads the miasma to other people there, who may next die at sea.

C. Leg. X, 910 B
People who build chapels and altars in their homes attract the wrath of the gods on the whole polis.

12. Diogenes Sinopensis
Fr. V B 415 Giannantoni (SSR II 388) ap. Gnom. Vat. 197
Since the best people are selected for sea voyages, one should not maintain contacts with the wicked on the land.

13. Aeschines
Or. 2, 158
Demosthenes' actions could bring a calamity to the entire city.

14. Theophrastus
Charact. 25, 2
During a storm the coward asks whether on the ship there are any people uninitiated in the mysteries.

15. Callimachus
Hymn. in Cer. 116–117
The poet does not wish to have as a neighbour someone who is hated by Demeter.

16. Horatius
Carm. III 2, 26–29
'vetabo, qui Cereris sacrum
volgarit arcanae, sub isdem
sit trabibus fragilemque mecum
solvat phaselon.'

17. Babrius
Fab. 117, 3–4
ἑνὸς γὰρ ἀσεβοῦς ἐμβεβηκότος πλοίῳ
πολλοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ μηδὲν αἰτίους θνήσκειν.

18. Petronius
Satyr. 105, 1
Someone who cuts his hair on a ship draws misfortune on all those who sail with him.

19. Aelianus
Nat. an. XIII 21
Six sailors died because they sailed with a person who had committed an impious act against Triton.

20. Philostratus
    Vita Apoll. VIII 5 (I 300 Kayser)
    False accusers lead cities to destruction.

21. Gregorius Nazianzenus
    Poemata moralia 29, 309 (PG 37, col. 907)
    The author advises the woman not to sail with bad women.

Bibliography

1. Editions

A. Editions of testimonies on Diagoras and fragments of his poetry

Bergk, Theodorus, *Poetae lyrici Graeci*, vol. III, Lipsiae [4]1882 (reprint Lipsiae 1914), pp. 562–563 (only fragments).

Smyth, Herbert Weir, *Greek Melic Poets*, London 1900, p. 73 (only fragments).

Edmonds, John Maxwell, *Lyra Graeca being the Remains of all the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus excepting Pindar*. Newly Edited and Translated, vol. III, London-New York 1927, pp. 56–67.

Lana, Italo, *Diagora di Melo*, Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, T. II, vol. 84 (1949–1950), Torino 1950, pp. 184–205, reprint in *idem*, *Studi sul pensiero politico classico*, Napoli 1973, pp. 83–104.

Jacoby, Felix, *Diagoras ὁ Ἄθεος*, Berlin 1959 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1959, 3), pp. 3–8.

Winiarczyk, Marek, *Diagorae Melii et Theodori Cyrenaei reliquiae*, Leipzig 1981 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), pp. 1–30.

Campbell, David A., *Greek Lyric*, IV: *Bacchylides, Corinna and Others*. Edited and Translated, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1992 (LCL 461), pp. 334–347.

B. Editions of authors cited in the book

Aelianus, *De natura animalium*, ed. A.F. Scholfield, vol. I–III, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1958–1959 (LCL 446, 448, 449).

—, *De natura animalium*, edd. M. Garcia Valdés, L.A. Llera Fuego, L. Rodriguez-Noriega Guillén, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 2009.

—, *Fragmenta*, ed. D. Domingo-Forasté, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1994.

—, *Varia historia*, ed. M.R. Dilts, Leipzig 1974.

Aelius Aristides, *Orationes*, vol. I, edd. F.W. Lenz, C.A. Behr, Leiden 1976–1980.

Aeschines, *Orationes*, ed. M.R. Dilts, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1997.

Aeschylus, *Fragmenta*, ed. St. Radt, Göttingen 1985 (TrGF 3).

—, *Tragoediae*, ed. M.L. West, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998.

Aëtius, *Placita philosophorum*, in *Doxographi Graeci*. Collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit H. Diels, Berolini 1879 ([4]1965), pp. 267–444.

Ammonius, *De adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, ed. K. Nickau, Lipsiae 1966.

Andocides, *De mysteriis*, ed. D.MacDowell, Oxford 1962 (many reprints).

—, *Orationes*, ed. G. Dalmeyda, Paris 1930.

Anthologia Palatina, ed. H. Beckby, vol. I–IV, München 1957–1958.

Antiphon, *Orationes*, ed. F. Blass, Lipsiae [2]1881.

—, *Tetralogiae*, ed. F. Decleva Caizzi, Milano 1969 (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 28).

Antisthenes, *Testimonia*, ed. G. Giannantoni, in SSR, vol. II, Napoli 1990, pp. 137–225.

Antisthenes Rhodius, *Φιλοσόφων διαδοχαί,* ed. R. Giannattasio Andria, Napoli 1989.

Apostolius Michael, *Paroemiae*, ed. E.L. Leutsch, in CPG, t. II, Gottingae 1851, pp. 231–744 (reprint Hildesheim 1958).

Apuleius, *Apologia*, ed. R. Helm, Leipzig [5]1972 (Opera, vol. II 1).
Aristonicus, *Περὶ σημείων Iliados*, ed. L. Friedlaender, Gottingae 1853.
Aristophanes, *Fabulae*, ed. N.G. Wilson, vol. I–II, Oxonii 2007.
—, F*ragmenta*, in PCG III 2, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1984.
Aristoteles, *Ars rhetorica*, ed. R. Kassel, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1976.
—, *Atheniensium respublica*, ed. M. Chambers, Leipzig 1986.
—, *Fragmenta*, ed. V. Rose, Lipsiae [3]1886 (reprint Stutgardiae 1967).
—, *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, ed. O. Gigon, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1987 (Opera, vol. III).
—, *Politica*, ed. A. Dreizehnter, München 1970 (Studia et testimonia antiqua 7).
Ps.-Aristoteles, *De virtute et vitiis*, in Aristoteles, *Ethica Eudemia*, ed. F. Susemihl, Lipsiae 1884, pp. 181–194.
—, *Problemata physica*, edd. C.Aem. Ruelle, H. Knoellinger, I. Klek, Lipsiae 1922.
Arnobius, *Adversus nationes*, ed. A. Reifferscheid, Vindobonae 1875 (CSEL 4).
—, ed. C. Marchesi, Augustae Taurinorum [2]1953 (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum).
Arsenius, *Violetum*, ed. Chr. Walz, Stuttgartiae 1832.
Athanasius, *Ex prolegomenis in Hermogenis Περὶ στάσεων*, in *Prolegomenon sylloge*, ed. H. Rabe, Lipsiae 1931 (Rhetores Graeci 14).
Athenaeus, *Dipnosophistae*, ed. G. Kaibel, vol. I–III, Lipsiae 1887–1890 (reprint Stutgardiae 1985–1992).
Athenagoras, *De resurrectione cadaverum*, ed. E. Schwartz, Leipzig 1891.
—, *Legatio pro Christianis*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1990 (PTS 31).
Augustinus, *Contra litteras Petiliani*, ed. M. Petschenig, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1909 (CSEL 52. Scripta contra donatistas, pars II).
—, *De civitate Dei*, edd. B. Dombart, A. Kalb, Turnholti 1955 (CCL 47).
Babrius, *Mythiambi Aesopi (= Fabulae)*, edd. M.J. Luzzato, A. La Penna, Leipzig 1986.
Bacchylides, *Carmina cum fragmentis*, edd. B. Snell, H.Maehler, Lipsiae [10]1970.
Bion Borysthenites, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, ed. J.F. Kindstrand, Uppsala 1976 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 11).
Bolus Mendesius, in DK II (68, B 300, 1–14), Berlin 1952 (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 210–218.
Callimachus, *Opera*, vol. I–II, ed. R. Pfeiffer, Oxonii 1949–1953 (reprint Oxonii 1965).
—, *Werke griechisch und deutsch*, hrsg. und übersetzt von M. Asper, Darmstadt 2004.
Cercidas Megapolitanus, *Meliambi*, in *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, fasc. 3: *Iamborum scriptores*, ed. E. Diehl, Lipsiae [3]1952 (reprint 1964), pp. 141–152.
—, ed. L. Lomiento, Romae 1993 (Lyricorum quae exstant 10).
Cicero, *De natura deorum*, edd. O. Plasberg, W. Ax, Lipsiae 1933 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 45) [reprint Stutgardiae 1968].
—, *Epistulae ad Atticum*, vol. V:211–354 (Books XI–XIII), ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge 1966 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 7).
—, *Tusculanae disputations*, ed. M. Pohlenz, Lipsiae 1918 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 44) [reprint Stutgardiae 1982].
Cinesias Atheniensis, in *Dithyrambographi Graeci*, ed. D.F. Sutton, Hildesheim-München-Zürich 1989, pp. 49–53.
Claudianus, *Carmina*, ed. J.B. Hall, Leipzig 1985.
Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus*, edd. O. Stählin, U. Treu, Berlin [3]1972 (GCS).
—, ed. M. Marcovich, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995 (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 34).
—, *Stromata*, l. I–VI, edd. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, U. Treu, Berlin [4]1985 (GCS).

Ps.-Clemens Romanus, *Recognitiones Rufino interprete*, ed. B. Rehm, Berlin 1965 (GCS 51).
Codex Leidensis Vossianus 68, in *Specimen academicum inaugurale quo continentur* Γνῶμαι κατ' ἐκλογὴν ἐκ τῶν Δημοκρίτου, Ἐπικούρου καὶ ἑτέρων φιλοσόφων καὶ ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων, ed. L.R. Beynen, Lugduni Batavorum 1837.
Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis, ed. S. Jäkel, Lipsiae 1964.
Corpus Parisinum, ed. D.M. Searby, Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter 2007.
Craterus Macedo, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, in FGrHist III B (no. 342), Leiden 1950, pp.199–205.
—, ed. D. Erdas, Tivoli 2002.
Crates Cynicus, *Fragmenta*, in SSR, vol. II, Napoli 1990, pp. 523–575.
Critias, in DK II (no. 88), Berlin 1952 (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 371–399.
Critias, in TrGF I (no. 19), Göttingen ^{2}1986, pp. 170–184.
Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Contra Iulianum libri I–II*, edd. P. Burguière, P. Évieux, Paris 1985 (SCh 322).
—, *Contra Iulianum*, edd. J. Aubert, J.-P. Migne, Parisiis 1859 (PG 76).
Damascius, *Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principiis in Platonis Parmenidem*, ed. C. Ae. Ruelle, Parisiis 1889.
Demetrius Magnes, *Περὶ ὁμωνύμων ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων*, ed. J. Mejer, in "Hermes" 109, 1981, pp. 447–472.
Democritus Abderites, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in DK II (no. 68), Berlin ^{6}1952 (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 81–230.
Ps.-Democritus Abderites, in FGrHist III A (no. 263), Leiden 1940, pp. 8–10.
Didymus Alexandrinus, *De trinitate*, edd. J.A. Mingarelli, J.P. Migne, Parisiis 1863 (PG 39).
Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, edd. F. Vogel, C.Th. Fischer, vol. I–V, Lipsiae 1888–1906.
Diogenes Apolloniates, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, in DK II (no. 64), Berlin ^{6}1952, (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 51–69.
Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, ed. T. Dorandi, Cambridge 2013 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 50).
Diogenes Oenoandensis, *The Epicurean Inscription*, ed. M.F. Smith, Napoli 1993 (La Scuola di Epicuro, suppl. 1).
Diogenes Sinopensis, *Testimonia*, in SSR, vol. II, Napoli 1990, pp. 227–509.
Ps.-Diogenes Sinopensis, *Epistulae*, ed. E. Müseler, Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich 1994 (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Neue Folge. 1. Reihe: Monographien 7), pp. 1–79.
Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, ed. C. Jacoby, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae 1885– 1905.
Dionysius Heracleota (vel Metathemenus), in SVF, vol. I, Lipsiae 1905, pp. 93–96.
Dionysius Scytobrachion, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, ed. J.S. Rusten, Opladen 1982 (Papyrologica Coloniensia 10).
Ps.-Dionusius Telmaharensis, *Chronicon*, edd. C. Siegfried, H. Gelzer, Lipsiae 1884.
Dithyrambographi Graeci, ed. D.F. Sutton, Hildesheim-München-Zürich 1989.
Doxographi Graeci, ed. H. Diels, Berlin 1879 (^{4}1965).
Ennius, *Reliquiae*, ed. J. Vahlen, Lipsiae ^{2}1903 (reprint Lipsiae 1928 and Amsterdam 1963).
—, *Tragediae*, ed. H.D. Jocelyn, Cambridge 1967 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 10).
Epicharmus, *Fragmenta*, in *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. I 1, ed. G. Kaibel, Berolini 1899, pp. 88–147.
Epictetus, *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*, ed. H. Schenkl, Lipsiae 1916 (reprint Stutgardiae 1965).
Epicurea, ed. H. Usener, Lipsiae 1887 (reprint Stutgardiae 1966).

Epicurus, *Opera*, ed. G. Arrighetti, Torino ²1973.
Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, ed. K. Holl, Leipzig 1915 (GCS 25).
—, *De fide*, ed. K. Holl, Leipzig 1933 (GCS 37).
Etymologicum Magnum, ed. Th. Gaisford, Oxonii 1848 (reprint Amsterdam 1967).
Ps.-Eudocia, *Violarium*, ed. J. Flach, Lipsiae 1880.
Euhemerus Messenius, *Reliquiae*, ed. M. Winiarczyk, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1991.
Eupolis, *Fragmenta*, in PCG V, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1986, pp. 294–539.
Euripides, *Fabulae*, ed. J. Diggle, vol. I–III, Oxonii 1981–1994.
—, *Fragmenta*, ed. R. Kannicht, Göttingen 2004 (TrGF 5).
Eusebius, *Die Chronik*. Aus dem Armenischen übersetzt. Hrsg. von J. Karst, Leipzig 1911 (GCS 20).
—, *Hieronymi Chronicon*, ed. R. Helm, Berlin ²1956 (GCS 47).
—, *Praeparatio evangelica*, edd. K. Mras, É. Des Places, vol. I–II, Berlin ²1982– ²1983 (GCS. Eusebius Werke VIII 1–2).
Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk, vol. I–IV, Lugduni Batavorum 1971–1987.
—, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Stallbaum, vol. I, Lipsiae 1825 (reprint Hildesheim 1960).
—, *Commentarii in Dionysii Periegetae Orbis descriptionem*, ed. C. Müller, in GGM, vol. II, Parisiis 1861, pp. 201–407.
Excerpta Latina Barbari, ed. C. Frick, in *Chronica minora*, vol. I, Lipsiae 1893.
Florilegium Ἄριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα, ed. H. Schenkl, WSt 11, 1889, pp. 1–42.
Florilegium Leidense (e cod. Leid. Voss. 13), ed. L.R. Beynen, Lugduni Batavorum 1837.
Florilegium Monacense, in Ioannes Stobaeus, *Florilegium*, ed. A. Meineke, vol. IV, Lipsiae 1857, pp. 267–290.
Galenus, *De usu partium*, vol. I–II, ed. G. Helmreich, Lipsiae 1907–1909 (reprint Amsterdam 1968).
Ps.-Galenus, *Historia philosopha*, in *Doxographi Graeci*, ed. H. Diels, Berolini, 1879 (⁴1965).
Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, ed. P.K. Marshall, vol. I–II, Oxonii 1968.
Gnomica Basileensia, ed. J.F. Kindstrand, Uppsala 1991 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 2).
Gnomologium Baroccianum, ed. I. Bywater, Oxonii 1878.
Gnomologium Vaticanum (e cod. Vat. Gr. 743), ed. L. Sternbach, Berlin 1963 (Texte und Kommentare 2).
The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and some Contemporary Epigrams, vol. I–II, ed. by A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, Cambridge 1968.
Griechische Grabgedichte. Griechisch und Deutsch, hrsg. von W. Peek, Berlin 1960 (Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7).
Heraclides Lembus, *Excerpta politiarum*, ed. M.R. Dilts, Durham, North Carolina 1971 (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs 5).
Heraclides Ponticus, *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, Basel-Stuttgart ²1969 (Die Schule des Aristoteles 7).
—, ed. E. Schütrumpf, New Brunswick-London 2008 (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 14).
Heraclitus Ephesius, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in DK I (no.22), Berlin ⁶1951 (reprint Zürich 2004), pp. 139–190.
Hermias Alexandrinus, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur, Paris 1901 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 133).

Hermippus, *Fragmenta*, in PCG V, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1986, pp. 561–604.
Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, in *idem*, *Opera*, ed. H. Rabe, Lipsiae 1913 (Rhetores Graeci 6) [reprint Stutgardiae 1969], pp. 1–27
Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. H.B. Rosén, vol. I, Leipzig 1987; vol. II, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1997.
Hesiodus, *Fragmenta*, edd. R. Merkelbach, M.L. West, Oxonii 1967 (reprint Oxonii 1999).
—, *Opera et dies*, ed. M.L. West, Oxford 1978 (reprint Oxford 1996).
Hesychius Alexandrinus, *Lexicon*, vol. I–II (A-O), ed. K. Latte, Hauniae 1953–1966.
—, *Lexicon*, vol. IV: T-Ω, edd. P.A. Hansen, I.C. Cunningham, Berlin- New York 2009 (SGLG XI 4).
Ps.-Hesychius Milesius, *De viris illustribus*, ed. J. Flach, Lipsiae 1880.
The Hibeh Papyri, ed. E.G. Turner, vol. II, London 1955.
Hieronymus, *Epistolae*, pars I, ed. I. Hilberg, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1910 (CSEL 54).
Himerius, *Declamationes et orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis,* ed. A. Colonna, Roma 1951 (Scriptores Graeci et Latini consilio Academiae Lynceorum editi).
Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1986 (PTS 25).
Homerus, *Ilias*, ed. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996 (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 2).
—, ed. M.L. West, vol. I–II, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998.
—, *Odyssea*, ed. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991 (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 1).
Horatius, *Opera*, ed. S. Borzsák, Leipzig 1984.
—, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae ^{3}1995.
Ibn Durayd, *Kitāb al-Muğtanā*, in F. Rosenthal, *Sayings of the Ancients from Ibn Durayd's Kitāb al-Mujtanā*, "Orientalia" NS 27, 1958, pp. 159–183.
Ioannes Chrysostomus, *Adversus Iudaeos orationes*, edd. B. de Montfaucon, J.- P. Migne, Parisiis 1862 (PG 48), coll. 843–942.
—, *In epistulam 1 ad Corinthios homiliae*, edd. B.de Montfaucon, J.-P. Migne, Parisiis 1862 (PG 61), coll. 9–381.
Ioannes Georgides, *Gnomologium*, in P. Odorico, *Il prato e l'ape. Il sapere sentenzioso del Monaco Giovanni,* Wien 1986 (Wiener Byzantinische Studien 17), pp. 119–255.
Iosephus Flavius, *Contra Apionem*, ed. B. Niese, Berolini 1889 (Opera, vol. V).
—, *Contra Apionem (versio Latina)*, in Iosephus Flavius, *Opera ex versione Latina antiqua*, ed. C. Boysen, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1898 (CSEL 37).
Isocrates, *Opera omnia*, ed. B.G. Mandilaras, vol. I–III, Monachii-Lipsiae 2003.
Iulianus Imperator, *Orationes* 1–5, ed. J. Bidez, Paris 1932 (Oeuvres completes, I 1).
—, *Orationes* 6–9, ed. G. Rochefort, Paris 1963 (Oeuvres complètes, II 1).
Lactantius, *De ira Dei*, ed. S. Brandt, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1893 (CSEL 27).
—, *Divinae institutiones*, ed. S. Brandt, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1890 (CSEL 19).
—, edd. E. Heck, A. Wlosok, fasc. 1: libri I–II, Monachii-Lipsiae 2005; fasc. 2: Libri III– IV, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 2007; fasc. 3: Libri V–VI, Berolini -Novi Eboraci 2009; fasc. 4: Liber VII, Appendix, Indices, Berolini-Bostoniae 2011.
Libanius, *Apologia Socratis*, ed. R. Foerster, Lipsiae 1909 (Opera, vol. V) [reprint Hildesheim 1963].
Lucanus, *De bello civili (Pharsalia)*, ed. D.R.Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae ^{2}1997.
Lucianus, *Opera*, ed. M.D. Macleod, vol. I–IV, Oxonii 1972–1987.
Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, ed. J. Martin, Lipsiae ^{5}1969.
Lysias, *Orationes cum fragmentis*, ed. C. Carey, Oxonii 2007.
Lysimachus Alexandrinus, in FGrHist III B (no. 382), Leiden 1950, pp. 251–258.

Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis*, in Thucydides, *Historiae*, vol. I, edd. H.S. Jones, J.E.Powell, Oxonii 1948 (many reprints).
Marmor Parium, in FGrHist II B (no. 239), Berlin 1929, pp. 992–1005.
Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Loci communes*, ed. S. Ihm, Stuttgart 2001 (Palingenesia 73).
Maximus Tyrius, *Dissertationes*, ed. M.B. Trapp, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1994.
Melanthius Atheniensis, in FGrHist III B (no. 326), Leiden 1950, pp. 86–87.
Menander, *Kolax*, in *Comoediae*, vol. II, ed. W.G. Arnott, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1996 (LCL 459), pp. 151–203.
Menander, *Epitrepontes*, in *Comoediae*, vol. I, ed. W.G. Arnott, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1997 (LCL 132), pp. 379–526.
Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, ed. B. Kytzler, Leipzig 1982 (^{2}1992).
Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik, *Muḫtār al-ḥikam wa maḥāsin al kalim*, ed. A. Badawi, Madrid 1958 (Publicaciones del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos).
Novum Testamentum, edd. K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren, New York-London-Edinburgh-Amsterdam-Stuttgart ^{2}1968.
Olympiodorus, *In Platonis Gorgiam commentaria*, ed. L.G. Westerink, Leipzig 1970.
Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, ed. P. Koetschau, Leipzig 1899 (GCS).
—, *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, ed. P. Koetschau, Leipzig 1899 (GCS), pp. 1–47.
Orphica et Orphicis similia, ed. A. Bernabé, Monachii-Lipsiae 2004–2005 (Poetae Epici Graeci. Pars II, fasc. 1–2).
Ovidius, *Amores*, ed. E.J. Kenney, Oxonii 1995.
—, *Fasti*, edd. J.G. Frazer, G.P. Goold, Cambridge, Mass.-London 2003 (LCL 253).
—, *Metamorphoses*, ed. W.S. Anderson, Leipzig ^{3}1985.
Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri, edd. K. Preisendanz, A. Henrichs, Stuttgart 1973–1974
P.Derveni, ed. R. Janko, ZPE 141, 2002, pp. 1–62.
—, edd. K. Tsantsanoglou, G. M. Parássoglou, in *The Derveni Papyrus*, Firenze 2006, pp. 61–125.
—, ed. A. Bernabé, in *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta*, pars II, fasc. 3, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 2007, pp. 169–269.
Petronius, *Satiricon reliquiae*, ed. K. Müller, Monachii-Lipsiae ^{4}2003.
Pherecrates, *Fragmenta*, in PCG VII, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1989.
Philo Alexandrinus, *De providentia*, ed. M. Hadas-Lebel, Paris 1973 (Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 35).
—, *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, ed. L. Cohn, Berolini, 1896 (Opera, vol. I), pp. 258–298.
Philochorus, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in FGrHist III B (no. 328), Leiden 1950 (reprint Leiden ^{3}1993), pp. 97–160.
Philodemus, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculanenis (PHerc. 1021 et 164)*, ed. T. Dorandi, Napoli 1991 (La Scuola di Epicuro 12).
—, *De pietate*, ed. Th. Gomperz, Leipzig 1866 (Herkulanische Studien 2).
—, *De pietate pars prior*, ed. A. Schober, CrErc 18, 1988, pp. 67–125 (= unpublished dissertation Königsberg 1923).
—, *De pietate, pars 1*, ed. D. Obbink, Oxford 1996.
—, *De stoicis (= PHerc. 155 et 339)*, ed. T. Dorandi, CrErc 12, 1982, pp. 91–133.
Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, ed. C.L. Kayser, Lipsiae 1870 (Opera, vol. I) [reprint Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985].

—, *Vitae sophistarum*, ed. C.L. Kayser, Lipsiae 1871 (Opera, vol. II) [reprint Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985].
Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, t. I–VIII, Paris 1959–1977.
—, *Lexicon*, I–III, ed. Ch. Theodoridis, Berlin-New York-Boston, 1982–2013.
Pindarus, *Carmina*, pars I: *Epinicia*, edd. B. Snell, H. Maehler, Leipzig ^{8}1987.
Plato, *Apologia*, ed. W.S.M. Nicoll, Oxonii 1995 (Opera, t. I).
—, *Leges*, ed. J. Burnet, Oxonii 1907 (Opera, vol. V).
—, *Phaedrus*, ed. L. Robin, Paris ^{7}1970 (Opera, t. IV 3).
Plato Comicus, *Fragmenta*, in PCG VII, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1989.
Plinius Maior, *Naturalis historia*, edd. L. Ian, C. Mayhoff, vol.I–VI, Lipsiae 1892–1909.
Plutarchus, *Alcibiades*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ^{3}1994 (Vitae Parallelae, I 2).
—, *An vitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat*, ed. M. Pohlenz, Leipzig 1972 (Moralia, vol. III).
—, *De audiendis poetis*, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner, Leipzig ^{2}1974 (Moralia, vol. I).
—, *De communibus notitiis*, edd. M. Pohlenz, R. Westman, Lipsiae ^{2}1959 (Moralia, vol. VI 2).
—, *De Daedalis Plataeensibus*, ed. F.H. Sandbach, Lipsiae 1967 (Moralia, vol. VII).
—, *De defectu oraculorum*, ed. W. Sieveking, Leipzig ^{2}1972 (Moralia, vol. III).
—, *De Iside et Osiride*, ed. J.G. Griffiths, Cardiff 1970.
—, ed. W. Sieveking, Leipzig ^{2}1971 (Moralia, vol. II).
—, *De stoicorum repugnantiis*, edd. M. Pohlenz, R. Westman, Lipsiae ^{2}1959 (Moralia, vol. VI 2).
—, *De superstitione*, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner, Leipzig ^{2}1974 (Moralia, vol. I).
—, *De tuenda sanitate praecepta*, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner, Leipzig ^{2}1974 (Moralia, vol. I).
—, *Nicias*, edd. C. Lindskog, K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ^{4}1994 (Vitae parallelae, vol. I 2).
—, *Pericles*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ^{3}1994 (Vitae parallelae, vol. I 2).
—, *Quaestiones convivales*, ed. C. Hubert, Leipzig ^{2}1971 (Moralia, vol. IV).
Ps.-Plutarchus, *De musica*, edd. K. Ziegler, M. Pohlenz, Leipzig ^{3}1966 (Moralia, vol. VI, fasc. 3).
Ps.-Plutarchus, *Placita philosophorum*, ed. J. Mau, Leipzig 1971 (Moralia, vol. VI, fasc. 2, pars 1).
Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ed. E. Bethe, I–II, Lipsiae 1900–1931 (Lexicographi Graeci 9).
Polyaenus, *Strategemata*, edd. E. Woelfflin, J. Melber, Lipsiae 1887.
Polybius, *Historiae*, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst, vol. I–V, Lipsiae 1889–1905.
Porphyrius, *Fragmenta*, ed. A. Smith, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1993.
Posidonius, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, edd. L. Edelstein, I.G. Kidd, Cambridge ^{2}1989 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 13).
—, ed. W. Theiler, vol. I–II, Berlin-New York 1982 (Texte und Kommentare X 1–2).
Prodicus Cius, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in DK II (no. 84), Berlin ^{6}1952 (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 308–319.
Propertius, *Elegiae*, ed. P. Fedeli, Stuttgart ^{2}1994.
Protagoras, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in DK II (no. 80), Berlin ^{6}1952 (reprint Zürich 2005), pp. 253–271.
Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria*, edd. L. Radermacher, V. Buchheit, pars 1, Leipzig ^{6}1971; pars 2, Leipzig ^{4}1971.
Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Leipzig 1903–1908 (GCS 9, 1–2).
Scholia in Apollonium vetera, ed. C. Wendel, Berolini 1935 (Bibliothecae Graecae et Latinae Auctarium Weidmannianum 4).

Scholia in Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticum, in Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus und Paedagogus,* edd. O. Stählin, U. Treu, Berlin ³1972 (GCS 12), pp. 295–318.
Scholia in Euripidem, ed. E. Schwartz, vol. I–II, Berolini 1887–1891.
Scholia in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera), ed. H. Erbse, vol. I–V, Berolini 1969–1977.
Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Aves, ed. D. Holwerda, Groningen 1991 (Scholia in Aristophanem, pars II, fasc. III).
Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Nubes, ed. D. Holwerda, Groningen, 1977 (Scholia in Aristophanem, pars I, fasc. III 1).
Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum, ed. M. Chantry, Groningen 1994 (Scholia in Aristophanemm, pars III, fasc. IV a).
Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Ranas, ed. M. Chantry, Groningen 1999 (Scholia in Aristophanem, pars III fasc. 1).
Scholium in Aelii Aristidis Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 258 (Or. 2 Behr = II 80 Dindorf), ed. B. Keil, "Hermes" 55, 1920, p. 65.
Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii*, ed. Ed. R. Waltz, Paris 1934.
—, *Dialogorum libri duodecim*, ed. L.D. Reynolds, Oxonii 1977.
—, *Epistulae morales*, ed. L.D. Reynolds, t. I–II, Oxonii 1965.
Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs, vol. I–II, Stuttgart 1979.
Servius, *In Vergilii Aeneidem commentarii*, ed. G. Thilo, vol. I–II, Lipsiae 1881–1884 (In Vergilii Carmina Commentarii, I–II).
Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus dogmaticos libri quinque (= Adv. mathem. VII–XI),* ed. H. Mutschmann, Lipsiae 1914 (reprint Leipzig 1984).
—, *Πυρρώνειοι ὑποτυπώσεις*, edd. H. Mutschmann, J. Mau, Lipsiae 1958.
Simplicius, *In Aristotelis De caelo commentaria*, ed. I.L. Heiberg, Berolini 1894 (CAG 7) [reprint Berlin 1958].
—, *In Epicteti enchiridion*, ed. I. Hadot, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996 (Philosophia antiqua 66).
Solon, *Elegiae*, in *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M.L. West, vol. II, Oxonii ²1989 (reprint Oxonii 1998), pp. 139–165.
Sophocles, *Fabulae*, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones, N.G. Wilson, Oxonii 1990.
—, *Fragmenta*, ed. St. Radt, Göttingen ²1999 (TrGF 4).
Spintharus, in TrGF II (no. 40), Göttingen 1981, pp. 168–169.
Stobaeus Ioannes, *Anthologium*, edd. O. Hense, C. Wachsmuth, vol. I–V, Berolini 1884–1912.
Strabo, *Geographika*, ed. St. Radt, vol. I–IV, Göttingen 2002–2005.
Strattis, *Fragmenta*, in PCG VII, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1989, pp. 623–660.
Suda, *Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, I–IV, Lipsiae 1928–1935 (Lexicographi Graeci 1).
Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων, ed. I.C. Cunningham, Berlin-New York 2003 (SGLG 10).
Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A.A. Mosshammer, Leipzig 1984.
Tatianus, *Oratio ad Graecos*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1990 (PTS 32).
Teleclides, *Fragmenta*, in PCG VII, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1989, pp. 667–692.
Tertullianus, *Apologeticum*, ed. E. Dekkers, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 1), pp. 77–171.
—, *Ad nationes*, ed. J.W.Ph. Borleffs, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 1), pp. 9–75.
—, *De anima*, ed. J.H. Waszink, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 2), pp. 779–869.
Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, ed. I. Raeder, Lipsiae 1904 (reprint Stutgardiae 1969).
Theodorus Cyrenaeus, *Testimonia*, in Diagoras Melius et Theodorus Cyrenaeus, *Reliquiae*, ed. M. Winiarczyk, Leipzig 1981, pp. 31–47.
—, ed. G.Giannantoni, in SSR, vol. II, Napoli 1990, pp. 119–133.

Theognis, *Elegiae*, ed. D. Young, Leipzig ²1971.
—, ed. M.L. West, in *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, vol. I, Oxonii ²1989 (reprint Oxonii 1998) pp. 172–241.
Theophilus Antiochenus, *Ad Autolycum*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1995 (PTS 44).
Theophrastus, *Characteres*, ed. J. Diggle, Cambridge 2004 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 43).
—, *De causis plantarum*, edd. B. Einarson, G.K.K. Link, vol. I–III, Cambridge, Mass.- London 1976–1990 (LCL 471, 474, 475).
—, *The Sources*, edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh et al., vol. I–II, Leiden 1992 (Philosophia antiqua LIV 1–2).
Theosophia Tubingensis, in *Theosophorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. H. Erbse, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1995, pp. 1–56.
Thucydides, *Historiae*, edd. H.S. Jones, J.E. Powell, vol. I–II, Oxonii 1942 (many reprints).
Tyrtaeus, in *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M.L. West, vol. II, Oxonii ²1989 (reprint Oxonii 1998), pp. 169–184.
Tzetzes, Ioannes, *Historiarum variarum chiliades*, ed. Th. Kiessling, Lipsiae 1826.
—, *Commentarii in Aristophanis Nubes*, ed. D. Holwerda, Groningen-Amsterdam 1960 (Scholia in Aristophanem, pars IV 2).
—, *Commentarii in Aristophanis Ranas et in Aves*, ed. W.J.W. Koster, Groningen- Amsterdam 1962 (Scholia in Aristophanem, pars IV 3).
Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, ed. J. Briscoe, vol. I–II, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998.
Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, ed. B. Cardauns, Wiesbaden 1976 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Geistes-und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse. Einzelveröffentlichung).
Pseudo-Varro, *Epigramma* in Varro*, Saturarum Menippearum reliquiae*, ed. A. Riese, Lipsiae 1865, p. 265.
Vergilius, *Aeneis*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxonii 1969.
Vita Sancti Phocae, ed. Van de Vorst, "Analecta Bollandiana" 30, 1911, pp. 272–279.
Xenophanes, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in DK I (no. 21), Berlin ⁶1951 (reprint Zürich 2004), pp. 113–139.
Xenophon Atheniensis, *Cyropaedia (Institutio Cyri),* edd. W. Gemoll, J. Peters, Leipzig ²1968.
—, *Hellenica (Historia Graeca),* ed. C. Hude, Lipsiae 1930.
—, *Hieron*, ed. Th. Thalheim, Lipsiae ²1915 (Scripta minora, fasc. 1), pp. 136–168.
—, *Memorabilia*, ed. C. Hude, Lipsiae 1934.
Zenobius, *Paroemiae*, in CPG I, Gottingae 1839.
Ps.-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, ed. I.A.H. Tittmann, Lipsiae 1808.

2. Research papers

Abernetty, Gualterus, *De Plutarchi qui fertur de superstitione libello*, Diss. Königsberg 1911.
Adam, Hella, *Plutarchs Schrift non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum. Eine Interpretation*, Amsterdam 1974 (Studien zur antiken Philosophie 4).
Adcock, Frank E., *The Attacks on the Friends of Pericles*, CAH V, 1927, pp. 477–480.
Adomenas, Mantas, *Heraclitus on Religion*, "Phronesis" 44, 1999, pp. 87–113.
Algra, Keimpe, *The Beginnings of Cosmology*, in Long, Anthony A.(ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*, Cambridge 1999, pp. 45–65.
—, *Stoic Theology*, in Inwood, Brad, (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 153–178.

Altheim, Franz, Stiehl, Ruth, *Porphyrios und Empedokles*, Tübingen 1954.
—, *New Fragments of Greek Philosophers, I: Empedocles, Democritus, Theophrastus in Arabic Translation*, "East and West" 12, 1961, pp. 3–18
Althoff, Jochen, *Sokrates als Naturphilosoph in Aristophanes Wolken*, in *idem* (Hrsg.), *Philosophie und Dichtung im antiken Griechenland*. Akten der 7. Tagung der Karl und Gertrud Abel-Stiftung am 10. und 11. Oktober 2002 in Bernkastell-Kues, Stuttgart 2007 (Philosophie der Antike 23), pp. 103–120.
Aouad, Maroun see Brisson, Luc
Arnim, Hans von, *Bion der Borysthenite*, RE III 1, 1897, coll. 483–485.
—, *review of von Fritz 1926*, DLZ 47, 1926, coll. 2418–2428.
Arrighetti, Graziano, *Filodemo fra poesia, mito e storia*, in *Epikureismus in der späten Republik und der Kaiserzeit*. Akten der 2. Tagung der Karl-und Gertrud-Abel-Stiftung vom 30. September–3. Oktober 1998 in Würzburg, hrsg. von Michael Erler in Zusammenarbeit mit Robert Bees, Stuttgart 2000 (Philosophie der Antike 11), pp. 13–31.
Atkinson, John Edward, *Curbing the Comedians: Cleon versus Aristophanes and Syracosius'Decree*, CQ 42, 1992, pp. 56–64, esp. pp. 61–64 ('Syracosius' decree').
Attridge, Harold W., *First-Century Cynicism in the Epistles of Heraclitus. Introduction, Greek Text and Translation*, Missoula, Montana 1976 (Harvard Theological Studies 29).
Auffarth, Christoph, *Der Opferstreik: Ein altorientalisches „Motiv" bei Aristophanes und im homerischen Hymnus*, GB 20, 1994, pp. 59–86.
—, *Aufnahme und Zurückweisung 'Neuer Götter' im spätklassischen Athen: Religion gegen die Krise, Religion in der Krise?,* in Eder, Walter (Hg.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* Akten eines Symposiums 3.–7. August 1992 Bellagio, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 337–365.
—, *Ein seltsamer Priest und seine Jünger. Typisches und Charakteristisches im Bühnen-Sokrates des Aristophanes*, in Pestalozzi, Karl (Hrsg.), *Der fragende Sokrates*, Stuttgart Leipzig 1999 (Colloquium Rauricum 6), pp. 77–97.
Aurenche, Olivier, *Les groupes d'Alcibiade, de Léagoras et de Teucros. Remarques sur la vie politique athénienne en 415 avant J.-C.*, Paris 1974 (Collections d'Études Anciennes).
Babut, Daniel, *La religion des philosophes grecs de Thalès aux Stoïciens*, Paris 1974 (Collection SUP. Littératures anciennes 4).
—, *Xénophane critique des poètes*, AC 43, 1974, pp. 83–117.
—, *Héraclite et la religion populaire. Fragments 14, 69, 68, 15 et 5 Diels-Kranz*, REA 77, 1975, pp. 27–62.
Badawi, 'Abd ar-Rahmān, *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe*, Paris 1968 (Études de philosophie médiévale, 56) [^{2}1987].
Barnes, Jonathan, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, London-New York ^{2}1989 (The Arguments of the Philosophers).
Barth, Hans-Martin, *Atheismus – Geschichte und Begriff*, München 1973 (Claudius Thesen, 6).
Battegazzore, Antonio, *Crizia*, in *Sofisti, Testimonianze e frammenti*, fasc. 4: *Antifonte*, *Crizia. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* a cura di A. Battegazzore e Mario Untersteiner, Firenze 1962 (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 7), pp. 214–363.
Bauslaugh, Robert A., *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford 1991.
Beatrice, Pier Franco, *L'accusation d'athéisme contre les chrétiens*, in Narcy, Michel, Rebillard, Eric (eds), *Hellénisme et christianisme*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2004 (Mythes, Imaginaires, Religions), pp. 133–152.

Bees, Robert, *Zenons Politeia*, Leiden-Boston 2011 (Studies on the Interaction of Art, Thought and Power 4).

Beloch, Karl Julius, *Griechische Geschichte*, II 2, Strassburg [2]1916 (reprint Berlin-Leipzig 1927 and Berlin 1967).

Bengtson, Hermann, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit,* München [5]1996 (HdA III 4).

Berdozzo, Fabio, *Götter, Mythen, Philosophen. Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen seiner Zeit*, Berlin-Boston 2011 (UaLG 106).

Berger, Klaus, *Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament*, ANRW II 25, 2, 1984, pp. 1031–1432.

Bergk, Theodor, *Commentationum de reliquiis comoediae Atticae antiquae libri duo*, Lipsiae 1838.

—, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, I, III, Berlin 1872–1884.

Bernabé, Alberto, *La théogonie orphique du papyrus de Derveni*, "Kernos", 15, 2002, pp. 91–129.

Bertelli, Lucio, *Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography*, in Luraghi, Nino (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford 2001, pp. 67–94

Betegh, Gábor, *The Derveni Papyrus. Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*, Cambridge 2004, esp. pp. 373–380 ('Diagoras and the Derveni author').

—, *Socrate et Archélaos dans les Nuées. Philosophie naturelle et éthique*, in *Comédie et philosophie. Socrate et les 'Présocratiques' dans les Nuées d'Aristophane*. Sous la direction d'André Laks et Rosella Saetta Cottone, Paris 2013 (Études de Littérature Ancienne 21), pp. 87–106.

Bettinetti, Simona, *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*. Presentazione di Walter Burkert, Bari 2001 ('Le Ranae'. Collana di Studi e Testi. Studi 30).

Bidez, Joseph, Cumont, Franz, *Les mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, t. I–II, Paris 1938 (reprint 1973).

Bienert, W.A., *'Allegoria' und 'Anagoge' bei Didymos dem Blinden von Alexandria*, Berlin- New York 1972 (PTS 13).

Bigwood, J. M., *Diodorus and Ctesias*, "Phoenix" 34, 1980, pp. 302–316.

Billerbeck, Margarethe (Hrsg.), Die *Kyniker in der modernen Forschung. Aufsätze mit Einführung und Bibliographie,* Amsterdam 1991 (Bochumer Studien zur Philosophie 15).

Blass, Friedrich, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, I: *Von Gorgias bis zu Lysias*, Leipzig [2]1887 (reprint Hidesheim 1962).

—, *Nachlese zu Bacchylides*, "Hermes" 36, 1901, pp. 272–273.

Bleckmann, Bruno, *Diodor, Ephoros und die Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, in Horster, Marietta, Reitz, Christiane (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, Stuttgart 2010 (Palingenesia 98), pp. 435–450.

Blumenthal, Albrecht von, *Palaiphatos*, RE XVIII 2, 1942, coll. 2451–2455.

Bobeth, Walter, *De indicibus deorum*, Diss. Leipzig 1904.

Bölte, Felix, *Mantineia*, RE XIV 2, 1930, coll. 1318–1323.

Bolkestein, Johanna Christina, *Ὅσιος en εὐσεβής. Bijdrage tot de godsdienstige en zedelijke terminologie van de Grieken,* Diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam 1936.

Bonner, Robert J., Smith, Gertrude, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, vol. I, Chicago 1930.

Bonnet, Hans, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschgichte*, 3., unveränderte Auflage, Berlin-New York 2000 ([1]1952).

Borin, Paola, *Ricerche su Erodoro di Eraclea (FGrHist 31)*, "Acme" 48, fasc. 3, 1955, pp. 145–154.
Borries, Bodo de, *Quid veteres philosophi de idololatria senserint*, Diss. Göttingen 1918.
Bosworth, Albert Brian, *The Humanitarian Aspect of the Melian Dialogue*, JHS 113, 1993, pp. 30–44, reprint in Rusten, Jeffrey S. (ed.), *Thucydides*, Oxford 2009 (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), pp. 312–336.
Bottler, Heike, *Pseudo-Plutarch und Stobaios: Eine synoptische Untersuchung*, Göttingen 2014 (Hypomnemata 198).
Boudreaux, Pierre, *Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs*. Ouvrage revu et publié après la mort de l'Auteur par Georges Méautis, Paris 1919 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 114).
Brancacci, Aldo, *Teodoro l'Ateo e Bione di Boristene fra Pirrone e Arcesilao*, "Elenchos" 3, 1982, pp. 55–85.
—, *La théologie d'Antisthène*, ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 15/16, 1985/1986, pp. 218–229.
Braswell, Bruce Karl, *Didymos of Alexandria. Commentary on Pindar Edited and Translated with Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and a Critical Catalogue of Didymos' Works*, Basel 2013 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 41).
Bratke, Eduard, *Die Stellung des Clemens Alexandrinus zum antiken Mysterienwesen*, "Theologische Studien und Kritiken" 60, 1887, pp. 647–708.
Braun, René, *Diogène le cynique et le 'credo' d'Ovide*, in *Philologie, littératures et histoire anciennes*, Paris 1979 (= 'Annales de la Faculté de Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice' 35, 1979), pp. 223–233.
Bremer, Dieter, *Von den frühen Philosophen zu den Sophisten*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer, Georg Rechenauer, Basel 2013, pp. 949–970.
Bremmer, Jan N., *Literacy and the Origins and Limitations of Greek Atheism*, in *Actus*. *Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson*, Edited by J. den Boeft and A.H.M. Kessels, Utrecht 1982, pp. 43–55.
—, *Religious Secrets and Secrecy in Classical Greece*, in Kippenberg, Hans G., Stroumsa, Guy G. (eds), *Secrecy and Concealment. Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions,* Leiden-New York-Köln 1995 (Studies in the History of Religions 65), pp. 61–78.
—, *Götter, Mythen und Heiligtümer im antiken Griechenland*, Darmstadt 1996.
—, *Aëtius, Arius Didymus and the Transmission of Doxography*, "Mnemosyne" 51, 1998, pp. 154–160.
—, *Atheism in Antiquity*, in Martin, Michael (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 11–26.
—, *Persian Magoi and the Birth of the Term "Magic"*, in *idem*, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, Leiden-Boston 2008 (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 8), pp. 235–247.
—, *Manteis, Magic, Mysteries and Mythography: Messy Margins of Polis Religion?,* "Kernos" 23, 2010, pp. 13–35.
Brisson, Luc, *review of Betegh*, CR 56, 2006, pp. 7–11.
Brisson, Luc, Aouad, Maroun, *Diagoras de Mélos*, DPhA II, 1994, pp. 750–757
Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, I, Leiden ^{2}1943.
—, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Supplbd. I, Leiden 1937.
Broderson, Kai, *,Das aber ist eine Lüge!'. Zur rationalistischen Mythenkritik des Palaiphatos*, in Haehling, Raban von (Hrsg.), *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt 2005, pp. 44–57.

Broggiato, Maria, *Giovanni Lido, Sui mesi 4.71: un nuovo frammento di Diagora di Melo?,* "Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca" 5, 2002, pp. 231–237.

Brox, Norbert, *Zum Vorwurf des Atheismus gegen die alte Kirche*, "Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift" 75, 1966, pp. 274–282.

Buchner, Edmund, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien und die Frage der Tributpflicht von Melos,* "Chiron" 4, 1974, pp. 91–99.

Buddaeus, Johann Franz, *Theses theologicae de atheismo et superstitione variis observationibus illustratae et in usum recitationum academicarum editae*, Jena ²1722 (reprint Traiecti ad Rhenum 1737).

Bullivant, Stephen, *Defining Atheism*, in *idem*, Ruse, Michael (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Atheism*, Oxford 2013 (Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology), pp. 11–21.

Burckhardt, Jacob, *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*, I, Berlin-Stuttgart 1898.

Buresch, Carl, *Klaros. Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des späteren Altertums. Nebst einem Anhange, das Anecdoton ΧΡΗΣΜΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΘΕΩΝ enthaltend*, Leipzig 1889 (reprint Aalen 1973).

Burkert, Walter, *Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans*, in Meyer, Ben F., Sanders, Ed Parish (eds), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3: *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, London 1982, pp. 1–22, 183–189, reprint in Burkert, Walter, *Kleine Schriften III*, pp. 191–216.

—, *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth,* translated by Peter Bing, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983. German version: *Homo Necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*. 2. um ein Nachwort erweiterte Auflage, Berlin-New York ²1997.

—, *Der Autor von Derveni: Stesimbrotos Περὶ τελετῶν?*, ZPE 62, 1986, pp. 1–5, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften III*, pp. 89–94.

—, *Concordia Discors: the Literary and the Archaeological Evidence on the Sanctuary of Samothrace,* in Marinatos, Nanno, Hägg, Robin (eds), *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*, London-New York 1993, pp. 178–191, reprint in Burkert, Walter, *Kleine Schriften III*, pp. 137–151.

—, *Philodems Arbeitstext zur Geschichte der Akademie. Zu Tiziano Dorandis Neuedition des Academicorum Index*, ZPE 97, 1993, pp. 87–94.

—, *Der geheime Reiz des Verborgenen: Antike Mysterienkulte*, in Kippenberg, Hans G., Stroumsa, Guy G. (eds), *Secrecy and Concealment. Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions,* Leiden-New York-Köln 1995 (Studies in the History of Religions 65), pp. 79–100, reprint in Burkert, Walter, *Kleine Schriften III,* pp. 1–20.

—, *Kulte des Altertums. Biologische Grundlagen der Religion*, München 1998.

—, *Die Griechen und der Orient. Von Homer bis zu den Magiern*. Aus dem Italienischen ins Deutsche übertragen vom Verfasser, München 2003.

—, *Die altorphische Theogonie nach dem Papyrus von Derveni*, in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften III*, pp. 95–111.

—, *Kleine Schriften III*: *Mystica, Orphica, Pythagorica*, hrsg. von Fritz Graf, Göttingen 2006 (Hypomnemata. Supplement-Reihe 2).

Bury, John Bagnell, *The Age of Illumination*, in CAH V, 1927, pp. 376–397.

Byl, Simon, *La parodie de Diogène d'Apollonie dans les 'Nuées'*, "Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire" 72, 1994, pp. 5–9.

Caduff, Gian Andrea, *Antike Sintflutsagen*, Göttingen, 1986 (Hypomnemata 82).

Cagnazzi, Silvana, *La spedizione ateniese contro Melo del 416 A.C. Realtà e propaganda*, Bari 1983 (Dipartimento di scienze dell' antichità di Bari: sezione storica. Documenti e studi 2).
Cancik, Hubert, Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, *The Truth of Images. Cicero and Varro on Image Worship*, in Assmann, Jan, Baumgarten, Albert I. (eds), *Representation in Religion. Studies in Honor of Moshe Barasch*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001 (Studies in the History of Religions 89), pp. 43–61.
Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, *Gottlosigkeit im Altertum. Materialismus – Pantheismus – Religionskritik – Atheismus*, in *eadem*, *Von Atheismus bis Zensur. Römische Lektüren in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht*, hrsg. von Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer und Barbara von Reibnitz, Würzburg 2006, pp. 15–31.
Canevaro, Mirko, Harris, Edward M., *The Documents in Andocides' On the Mysteries*, CQ 62, 2012, pp. 98–129.
Capelle, Wilhelm, *review of Gerhard 1909*, NJA 14, 1911, pp. 314–319.
—, Μετέωρος – μετεωρολογία, "Philologus" 71, 1912, pp. 414–448.
—, *Älteste Spuren der Astrologie bei den Griechen*, "Hermes" 60, 1925, pp. 373–395.
—, *Meteorologie*, RE Suppl. VI, 1935, coll. 315–358.
—, *Diatribe (Nichtchristlich)*, RAC III, 1957, coll. 990–997.
Capra, Andrea, *Platone e la storia. La fine di Protagora e lo statuto letterario dei dialoghi socratici*, "Acme" 52, 2, 2000, pp. 19–37.
Caravan, Edwin, *The Athenian Amnesty and Reconstructing the Law*, Oxford 2013.
Cardauns, Burkhart, *Di gentium*, Augustinus Lexikon II, 1996–2002, coll. 368–381.
Carena, Maria, *La critica della mitologia pagana negli apologeti greci del II secolo*, "Didaskaleion.Studi di letteratura e storia Cristiana antica" NS 1, 1923, fasc.1, pp. 23–55; fasc.2, pp. 3–42.
Casadio, Giovanni, *Adversaria Orphica: A proposito di un libro recente sull'*orfismo, "Orpheus" NS 8, 1987, pp. 381–395.
Casanova, Angelo, *La revisione delle Nuvole di Aristofane*, "Prometheus" 26, 2000, pp. 19– 34.
Càssola, Filippo, *Diodoro e la storia romana*, ANRW II 30, 1, 1982, pp. 724–773.
Cavenaugh, Maureen B., *Eleusis and Athens. Documents in Finance, Religion, and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.,* Atlanta 1996 (American Classical Studies 35).
Chadwick, Henry, *Florilegium*, RAC VII, 1969, coll. 1131–1160.
Chamoux, François, *Un historien mal-aimé: Diodore de Sicile*, BAGB 1990, pp. 243–252.
—, *Introduction générale. Diodore: l'homme et l'oeuvre*, in *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque Historique*, I, Paris 1993 (Collection G. Budé).
Chaniotis, Angelos, Mylonopoulos, Ioannis, Stavrianopoulou, Eftychia, *Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion 1996*, "Kernos" 12, 1999, pp. 207–292.
Chilton, C.W., *An Epicurean View of Protagoras. A Note on Diogenes of Oenoanda*, *Fragment XII (W),* "Phronesis" 7, 1962, pp. 105–109.
Cipolla, Paolo, *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco.Testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Amsterdam 2003 (Supplementi di Lexis 23).
Clerc, Charly, *Les théories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs du IIeme siècle après J.-C.*, Paris 1915.
Clinton, Kevin, *The Nature of the Late Fifth-Century Revision of the Athenian Law Code*, "Hesperia" Suppl. 19, 1982, pp. 27–37.
—, *Myth and Cult. The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Martin P. Nilsson Lectures on Greek Religion, Delivered 19–21 November 1990 at the Swedish Institute at Athens*, Stockholm 1992 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, series in 8°, 11).

—, *Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries*, in Cosmopoulos, Michael B. (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London-New York, 2003, pp. 50–78.
—, *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, vol. I A: *Text*, vol. I B: *Plates*, Athens, 2005 (The Archaeological Society at Athens Library 236).
—, *The Eleusinian Sanctuary during the Peloponnesian War*, in Palagia, Olga (ed.), *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, Cambridge 2009, pp. 52–65.
Cogniot, Georges, *Le matérialisme gréco-romain*, Paris 1964.
Cohen, David, *The Prosecution of Impiety in Athenian Law*, "Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte " 105, 1988, pp. 695–701 and in Thür, Gerhard (Hrsg.), *Symposium 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Ringberg, 24–26. Juli 1985)*, Köln-Wien 1989 (Akten der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 6), pp. 99–107. Slightly changed version in Cohen, David, *Law, Sexuality, and Society. The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1991, pp. 203–217.
Cohn, Leopold, *Ammonios*, RE I 2, 1894, coll. 1865–1866.
Cole, Susan Guettel, *Theoi Megaloi. The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*, Leiden 1984 (EPRO 96).
Cole, Thomas, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, Atlanta, Georgia ^{2}1990 (American Philological Association. Monograph Series 25) [^{1}1967, with Postscript (1990), Addenda and Selected Bibliography (1967–88)].
Colin, Frédéric, *L'Isis 'dynastique' et la Mère des dieux phrygienne*, ZPE 102, 1994, pp. 271–294.
Collard, Christopher, *The Pirithous Fragments* [1995], reprint in *idem*, *Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans. Selected Papers,* Exeter 2007, pp. 56–68 (pp.67–68 Endnote 2006).
Collini, Paolo, *Gli dèi Cabiri di Samotracia: origine indigena o semitica?*, SCO 40, 1990, pp. 237–287.
Corradi, Michele, *Protagora facchino e l'invenzione del cercine*, RFIC 134, 2005, pp. 392– 412.
—, *L'origine della tradizione sul processo di Protagora*, in Erler, Michael, Schorn, Stefan (Hgg.), *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit.* Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.–29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*,* Berlin-New York 2007 (BzA 245), pp. 285–301.
—, *Protagora tra filologia e filosofia. Le testimonianze di Aristotele*, Pisa-Roma 2012 (Biblioteca di studi antichi 96).
Corsini, Eugenio, *Gli 'Uccelli' di Aristofane: utopia o satira politica?*, in Uglione, Renato (ed.), *Atti del Convegno Nazionale di studi su la città ideale nella tradizione classica e biblico-cristiana*, Torino 2–4 Maggio, 1985, Torino 1987, pp. 57–136, esp. pp. 108–111 ('La psicosi della tirannide').
Cottrell, Emily J., *Notes sur quelques-uns des témoignages médiévaux relatifs à l'Histoire philosophique (ἡ φιλόσοφος ἱστορία) de Porphyre*, in Akasoy, Anna, Raven, Wim (ed.), *Islamic Thought in the Middle Ages. Studies in Text, Transmission and Translation, in Honour of Hans Daiber*, Leiden-Boston 2008 (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies 75), pp. 523–555.
—, *Al-Mubashshir ibn Fātik*, in Lagerlund, Henrik (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy between 500 and 1500*, II, Dordrecht-Heidelberg-London-New York 2011, pp. 815–818.
—, *al-Shahrazūrī, Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd Shams al Dīn*, in Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia*…., pp. 1190–1194.

Crombach, Mechthild,'*Bocados de Oro'. Kritische Ausgabe des altspanischen Textes*, Bonn 1971 (Romanistische Versuche und Vorarbeiten 37).

Csapo, Eric, Slater, William J., *The Context of Ancient Drama*, Ann Arbor 1995.

Curtius, Ernst, *Griechische Geschichte*, III, Berlin [5]1880.

Daiber, Hans, *Das theologisch-philosophische System des Mu'ammar ibn 'Abbād as-Sulamī (gest. 830 n. Chr.)*, Beirut 1975 (Beiruter Texte und Studien 19).

—, *Aetius Arabus. Die Vorsokratiker in arabischer Überlieferung*, Wiesbaden 1980 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur Mainz. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommision 33).

—, *Semitische Sprachen als Kulturvermittler zwischen Antike und Mittelalter. Stand und Aufgaben der Forschung*, ZDMG 136, 1986, pp. 292–313.

—, *Possible Echoes of De mundo in the Arabic-Islamic World: Christian, Islamic and Jewish Thinkers*, in Thom, Johan C. (ed.), *Cosmic Order and Divine Power. Pseudo-Aristotle, On the Cosmos. Introduction, Text, Translation and Interpretative Essays* (...), Tübingen 2014 (SAPERE 23), pp. 169–180.

Daumas, Michel, *Des Thèbes à Lemnos et Samothrace. Remarques nouvelles sur le culte des Cabires*, "Topoi" 12/13, 2005, pp. 851–881.

Davies, Malcolm, *Sisyphus and the Invention of Religion (Critias TrGF 1 [43] 19 = B 25 DK),* BICS 36, 1989, pp. 16–32.

Davison, J.A., *Protagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras*, CQ 47, 1953, pp. 33–45.

Decharme, Paul, *La critique des traditions religieuses chez les Grecs des origines au temps de Plutarque*, Paris 1904 (reprint Bruxelles 1966).

Decleva Caizzi, Fernanda, *La tradizione protagorea ed un frammento di Diogene di Enoanda*, RFIC 104, 1976, pp. 435–442.

Degani, Enzo, *Aristophane et les manteaux de Pellène*, in *Aristophane: La langue, la scène, la cité*. Actes du colloque de Toulouse 17–19 mars 1994 édités par Pascal Thiercy et Michel Menu, Bari 1997 ('le Ranae'. Collana di Studi e Testi 20), pp. 107–112.

Deininger, Georg, *Der Melier-Dialog (Thuk. V 85–113),* Diss. Erlangen, Erlangen-Bruck 1939.

Del Corno, Dario, *Aristofane, Le Ranae*, Milano 1985 (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. Scrittori Greci e Latini).

Del Grande, Carlo, *Negazione di un ateismo ellenico*, in *Il problema dell'ateismo*, Brescia [2]1966 (Centro di Studi Filosofici de Gallarate), pp. 19–34.

Delli Pizzi, Aurian, *Impiety in Epigraphic Evidence*, "Kernos" 24, 2011, pp. 59–76.

Derenne, Eudore, *Les procès d'impiété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes au Ve et IVe siècles avant J.-C.*, Liège-Paris 1930 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 45) [reprint New York 1976].

De Sanctis, Gaetano, *Intorno al razionalismo di Ecateo*, RFIC 61 (NS 11), 1933, pp. 1–15, reprint in *idem*, *Studi di storia della storiografia greca*, Firenze 1951, pp. 3–19.

Desmond, William, *Cynics*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 2008 (Ancient Philosophies 3)

Deubner, Ludwig, *Attische Feste*. 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage von Bruno Doer, Berlin 1966.

Develin, Robert, *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.*, Cambridge 1989.

Dickey, Eleanor, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford 2007 (American Philological Association. Classical Resources Series 7).

Diels, Hermann, *Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronika*, RhM 31, 1876, pp. 1–54.
—, *Doxographi Graeci. Collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit*, Berolini 1879 ([4]1965).
—, *Über Leukipp und Demokrit* [1881], in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, hrsg. von Walter Burkert, Hildesheim 1969, pp. 185–198.
Dieterich, Albrecht, *Der Untergang der antiken Religion*, in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig-Berlin 1911, pp. 449–539.
Dieterich, Karl, *Die präpositionalen Präfixe in der griechischen Sprachentwicklung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Mittel- und Neugriechischen*, "Indogermanische Forschungen" 24, 1909, pp. 87–158.
Dihle, Albrecht, *Das Satyrspiel "Sisyphos"*, "Hermes" 105, 1977, pp. 28–42.
—, *Philosophie und Tradition im 5. Jahrhundert v. C.*, in Herding, Otto, Olshausen, Eckart (Hgg.), *Wegweisende Antike. Zur Aktualität humanistischer Bildung. Festgabe für Georg Wöhrle*, Stuttgart 1986 (Humanistische Bildung, Beih. 1), pp. 13–24.
—, *Aufklärung in der Antike?*, in Rudolph, Enno (Hrsg.), *Die Vernunft und ihr Gott. Studien zum Streit zwischen Religion und Aufklärung*, Stuttgart 1992, pp. 13–32.
—, *Die Theologia tripertita bei Augustin*, in Cancik, Hubert (Hrsg.), *Geschichte- Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel*, II, Tübingen 1996, pp. 183–202.
—, *Die Philosophie der Barbaren*, in Hölscher, Tonio (Hrsg.), *Gegenwelten zu den Kulturen Griechenlands und Roms in der Antike*, München-Leipzig 2000, pp. 183– 203.
—, *Hellas und der Orient. Phasen wechselseitiger Rezeption*, Berlin-New York 2009 (Julius-Wellhausen-Vorlesung 2).
Dimitrova, Nora M., *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace. The Epigraphical Evidence*, Princeton 2008 (Hesperia suppl. 37).
Dindorf, Guillelmus (= Wilhelm), *Praefatio*, in Dübner, Friedrich (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem cum prolegomenis grammaticorum* (...), Parisiis 1855, pp. III–X.
Dodds, Eric Robertson, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley-Los Angeles [2]1956 (Sather Classical Lectures 25).
Dodge, Bayard, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. Translated by B. Dodge, I–II, New York-London 1970.
Döring, August, *Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*, I, Leipzig, 1903.
Döring, Klaus, *Sokrates, die Sokratiker und die von ihnen begründeten Traditionen*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. II 1: *Sophistik, Sokrates, Sokratik, Mathematik, Medizin*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Basel 1998, pp. 139–364.
—, *Sokrates und die Naturphilosophie*, "Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption" 20, 2010, pp. 9–23.
Dörrie, Heinrich, *Diagoras*, KP I, 1964, col. 1507.
—, *Gottesvorstellung*, RAC XII, 1983, coll. 81–154.
—, *Zu Varros Konzeption der theologia tripertita in den Antiquitates rerum di*vinarum, in *Beiträge zur altitalischen Geistesgeschichte. Festschrift für Gerhard Radke zum 18. Februar 1984*, hrsg. von Ruth Altheim-Stiehl, Manfred Rosenbach, Münster, 1986, pp. 76–82.
Dollmayer, Viktor (Hrsg.), *Die Geschichte des Pfarrers vom Kalenberg*, Halle a.S. 1906.
Donohue, Alice A., *The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology*, "Hephaistos" 15, 1997, pp. 31–45.

Dorandi, Tiziano, *Filodemo: gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale*, ANRW II 36, 4, 1990, pp. 2238–2368.
—, *Filodemo storico del pensiero antico*, ANRW II 36, 4, 1990, pp. 2407–2423.
—, *Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut. Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den antiken Schriftstellern*, ZPE 87, 1991, pp. 11–33.
—, *Dichtender Philosoph und philosophischer Dichter: Das literarische Schaffen des Epikureers Philodem von Gadara*, WüJbb 18, 1992, pp. 183–193.
Dorion, Louis-André, *The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem*, in Morrison, Donald R. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, Cambridge 2011, pp. 1–23.
Dover, Kenneth James, *Aristophanes*, *Clouds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1968 (reprint Oxford 2003).
—, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1968 (Sather Classical Lectures 39).
—, *Socrates in the Clouds*, in Vlastos, Gregory (ed.), *The Philosophy of Socrates. A Collection of Critical Essays*, Garden City, NY. 1971 [reprint Notre Dame 1980] (Modern Studies in Philosophy), pp. 50–77
—, *The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society*, "Talanta" 7, 1975, pp. 24–54, reprint with *Additional Note* in *idem*, *The Greeks and Their Legacy* (...), II, pp. 135–158.
—, *Anecdotes, Gossip and Scandal*, in *idem*, *The Greeks and Their Legacy* (...), II, pp. 45–52.
—, *The Greeks and Their Legacy. Collected Papers, II: Prose Literature, History, Society, Transmission, Influence*, Oxford-New York 1988.
—, *Aristophanes, Frogs. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1993.
Drachmann, Anders Björn, *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, London-Copenhagen-Christiania 1922 (reprint Chicago 1977).
Dragona-Monachou, Myrto, *The Stoic Arguments for the Existence and the Providence of the Gods*, Diss. London 1973, Athens 1976.
Dreßler, Jan, *Philosophie vs. Religion? Die Asebie-Verfahren gegen Anaxagoras, Protagoras und Sokrates im Athen des fünften Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Nordestedt 2010.
Dudley, Donald Reynolds, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century AD*. Second Edition. Foreword and Bibliography by Miriam Griffin, Bristol, 1998 (1st edition London 1937).
Dunbar, Nan, *Aristophanes, Birds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1995.
Dunlop, D.M., *The Muntakhab Siwān al-hikmah of Abū Sulaimān as-Sijistānī. Arabic Text, Introduction and Indices*, The Hague-Paris-New York 1979 (Near and Middle East Monographs 4).
Eberhardt, Walter, *Der Melierdialog und die Inschriften ATL A 9 (IG I2 63+) und IG I2 97+*, "Historia" 8, 1959, pp. 284–314.
Eder, Robert, *Tignonvillana inedita*, "Romanische Forschungen" 33, 1915, pp. 851–1022.
Edmonds, Hilarius, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum. Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*, Leipzig 1941 (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 14).
Edmonds, John Maxwell, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, I, Leiden 1957.
Edmonds, Radcliffe G., *Extra-ordinary People: Mystai and Magoi. Magicians and Orphics in the Derveni Papyrus*, CPh 103, 2008, pp. 16–39.
—, *Redefining Ancient Orphism. A Study in Greek Religion*, Cambridge 2013.
Edwards, Michael, *Greek Orators*, IV: *Andocides*, Edited and Translated, Warminster 1995, esp. pp. 17–26 ("Andocides' part in the mysteries and Hermae affairs").
Edwards, M.J., *Notes on the Derveni Commentator*, ZPE 86, 1991, pp. 203–211.
Edwards, Paul, *Definition of "Atheism",* in *idem* (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, I, New York 1967, pp. 175–177.

Egli, Franziska, *Euripides im Kontext zeitgenössischer intellektueller Strömungen. Analyse der Funktion philosophischer Themen in den Tragödien und Fragmenten*, München-Leipzig 2003 (BzA 189).

Eich, Peter, *Gottesbild und Wahrnehmung. Studien zu Ambivalenzen früher griechischer Götterdarstellungen (ca. 800 v.Chr.-ca. 400 v.Chr.)*, Stuttgart 2011 (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 34).

Eisenberger, Herbert, *Demokrits Vorstellung vom Sein und Wirken der Götter*, RhM 113, 1970, pp. 141–158.

Eisler, Robert, *Zu Demokrits Wanderjahren*, AGPh 31 (NF 24), 1918, pp. 187–211.

Endress, Gerhard, *Die wissenschaftliche Literatur*, in Gätje, Helmut (Hrsg.), *Grundriß der Arabischen Philologie*, II: *Literaturwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden 1987, pp. 400–506.

Erbse, Hartmut, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburg 1941 (Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft 4).

—, *Plutarchs Schrift Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας,* "Hermes" 80, 1952, pp. 296–314.

—, *Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur*, in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, I, Zürich 1961 (reprint München 1975), pp. 207–283.

—, *Über die ersten ‚Wolken' des Aristophanes*, in *Opus nobile. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Ulf Jantzen,* hrsg. von P. Zazoff, Wiesbaden 1969, pp. 35–41, reprint in Newiger, Hans-Joachim (Hrsg.), *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie*, Darmstadt 1975 (WdF 265), pp. 198–211.

—, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)*, II, Berolini 1971.

Erdas, Donatella, *Cratero il Macedone. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Tivoli 2002 (I Frammenti degli Storici Greci 2).

—, *Niebuhr, Jacoby e l'identità di Cratero il Macedone, in* Lanzillotta, Eugenio (ed.), *Ricerche di antichità e tradizione classica*, Tivoli 2004 (Ricerche di filologia, letteratura e storia 3), pp. 91–102.

Erler, Michael, *Epikur*, in *Grundriss der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, IV: *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Basel 1994, pp. 29–202.

—, *Philodem aus Gadara*, in *Grundriss der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, IV (…), pp. 289–362.

Esbroeck, Michel van, *Les sentences morales des philosophes grecs dans les traditions orientales*, in Pavan, Massimiliano, Cozzoli, Umberto (ed.), *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, Roma 1986, pp. 11–23.

Esser, Guilelmus, *De prima et altera quae fertur Nubium Aristophanis editione*, Diss. Bonn 1821.

Essler, Holger, *Glückselig und unsterblich. Epikureische Theologie bei Cicero und Philodem. Mit einer Edition von PHerc. 152/157, Kol. 8–10*, Basel 2011 (Schwabe Epicurea 2).

Fabricius, Johannes Albertus, *Bibliotheca Graeca sive notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum quorumcumque monumenta integra aut fragmenta edita exstant* […] Editio quarta variorum curis emendatior atque auctior curante Gottlieb Christophoro Harles, I–XII, Hamburg 1790–1801 (reprint Hildesheim 1966–1970).

Fabrini, Pierangiolo, *Sulla rappresentabilità delle Nuvole di Aristofane*, ASNP. Classe di lettere e filosofia, serie III, vol. V 1, 1975, pp. 1–16.

Fahr, Wilhelm, *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN. Zum Problem der Anfänge des Atheismus bei den Griechen,* Hildesheim 1969 (Spudasmata 26).

Fales, F.M., *Storia di Ahiqar tra Oriente e Grecia: la prospettiva dall'antico Oriente*, QS 38, 1993, pp. 143–166.

Fascher, Erich, *Der Vorwurf der Gottlosigkeit in der Auseinandersetzung bei Juden,Griechen und Christen*, in *Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel.Festschrift für Otto Michel*, hrsg. von Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, Peter Schmidt, Leiden-Köln 1963 (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums 5), pp. 78–105.

Ferguson, John, ΔΙΝΟΣ, "Phronesis" 16, 1971, pp. 97–115.

Ferrari, Franco, *Derveni Papyrus. F. Ferrari Edition*. CHS-iMouseion Project. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn–3:hul.eresource:Derveni_Papyrus_FerrariF_ed_2012.

Fertonani, Roberto, *Ecateo di Mileto e il suo razionalismo*, PP 7, 1952, pp. 18–29.

Festa, Nicolaus, Palaephatus, Περὶ ἀπίστων, Lipsiae 1902 (Mythographi Graeci III 2).

Festugière, André Jean, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste*,vol. I: *L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris 1989 (Collection d'Études Anciennes. Série grecque 75) [[1]1950].

Fiedrowicz, Michael, *Christen und Heiden. Quellentexte zu ihrer Auseinandersetzung in der Antike*, Darmstadt 2004.

Filonik, Jakub, *Athenian Impiety Trials: A Reappraisal*, "Dike" 16, 2013, pp. 11–96.

Fisher, Raymond K., *Aristophanes Clouds. Purpose and Technique*, Amsterdam 1984.

Flower, Michael Attyah, *The Seer in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2008.

—, *Athenian Religion and the Peloponnesian War*, in: Palagia, Olga (ed.), *Art in Athens During the Peloponnesian War*, Cambridge 2009, pp. 1-23.

Ford, Andrew L., *Dionysos'Many Names in Aristophanes'Frogs*, in Schlesier, Renate (ed.), *A Different God? Dionysos and Ancient Polytheism*, Berlin-Boston 2011, pp. 343–355.

Forsdyke, Sara, *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy*, Princeton-Oxford 2005.

Fougères, Gustave, *Mantinée et l'Arcadie orientale*, Paris 1898 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 78).

Fowler, Don, *Taplin on Cocks*, CQ 39, 1989, pp. 257–259.

Fowler, Robert L., *Early Greek Mythography*, II: *Commentary*, Oxford 2013.

Franceschini, Ezio, *Il "Liber philosophorum moralium antiquorum". Testo critico,* "Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti", t. 91, 2, 1931/32, Venezia 1932, pp. 393–597.

Frank, Erich, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth*, Oxford 1949.

Fraser, Peter Marshall, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I–III, Oxford 1972 (reprint Oxford 1990).

Fraser, Peter Marshall *et al*., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. I–V, Oxford 1987–2014.

Fredouille, Jean-Claude, *Götzendienst*, RAC XI 1981, coll. 828–895.

Fritz, Kurt von, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu Leben und Philosophie des Diogenes von Sinope*, Leipzig, 1926 (Philologus Supplbd. XVIII 2).

—, *Theodoros*, RE V A 2, 1934, coll. 1825–1831.

—, *Protagoras*, RE XXIII 1, 1957, coll. 908–921.

—, *Zur "Rettung" des Protagoras*, in Ἀρετης μνήμη. Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς μνήμην τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Ἰ. Βουρβέρη, Ἀθηνα 1983, pp. 59–69.

Frede, Michael, *Aëtiana*, "Phronesis" 44, 1999, pp. 135–149.

Fritzsche, Franz Volkmar, *Aristophanis Ranae. Emendavit et interpretatus est*, Turici 1845.

Frost, Frank J., *Pericles, Thucydides, Son of Melesias, and Athenian Politics before the War*, "Historia" 13, 1964, pp. 385–399, reprint in Wirth, Gerhard (Hrsg.), *Perikles und seine Zeit*, Darmstadt, 1979 (WdF 412), pp. 271–289.

Fück, J.W., *Ibn Durayd*, EI[2] III, 1971, coll. 757a–758a.

Fuentes González, Pedro Pablo, *Les Diatribes de Télès. Introduction, texte revu, traduction et commentaire des fragments*, Paris 1998 (Histoire des doctrines de l'antiquité classique 23).

Funke, Hermann, *Götterbild*, RAC XI 1981, coll. 829–895.

Furley, W.D., *Andokides and the Herms. A Study of Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion,* London 1996 (BICS, Suppl. 65).
Gabrielsson, Johannes, *Über die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*, I, Diss. Uppsala 1906.
Gärtner, Hans, *Dionysios Skytobrachion*, KP II, 1967, coll. 69–70.
Gagné, Renaud, *Mystery Inquisitors: Performance, Authority, and Sacrilege at Eleusis*, ClAnt 28, 2009, pp. 211–247.
Gallistl, Bernhard, *Teiresias in den Bakchen des Euripides*, Diss. Zürich, Würzburg 1979.
Gambato, Maria Luisa, in *Ateneo, I deipnosofisti. I dotti a banchetto*. Prima edizione italiana commentata su progetto di Luciano Canfora. Introduzione di Christian Jacob, vol. III, Roma, 2001.
Geffcken, Johannes, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig-Berlin 1907 (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern) [reprint Hildesheim-New York 1970].
—, *Der Bilderstreit des heidnischen Altertums*, ARW 19, 1916/1919, pp. 286–315.
—, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, I: *Von den Anfängen bis auf die Sophistenzeit. Anmerkungen*, Heidelberg 1926 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 4).
Geisau, Hans von, *Dardanos*, KP I, 1964, coll. 1388–1389.
Geissler, Paul, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, Dublin-Zürich [2]1969 (reprint of the book published in Berlin 1925 [PhU 30] with the author's supplement [pp. VII–XIX]).
Gelzer, Thomas, *Aristophanes*, RE Suppl. XII, 1970, coll. 1392–1569.
Gemelli Marciano, Maria Laura, *Die Vorsokratiker*, Bd. I. *Griechisch-lateinisch-deutsch. Auswahl der Fragmente und Zeugnisse, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, Düsseldorf 2007 (Sammlung Tusculum).
Gemoll, Wilhelm, *Das Apophthegma. Literarhistorische Studien*, Wien-Leipzig 1924.
Gera, Deborah Levine, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language, and Civilization*, Oxford 2003.
Gerhard, Gustav Adolf, *Phoinix von Kolophon. Texte und Untersuchungen*, Leipzig-Berlin 1909.
—, *Zur Legende vom Kyniker Diogenes*, ARW 15, 1912, pp. 388–408, reprint in Billerbeck, Margarethe (Hrsg.), *Die Kyniker in der modernen Forschung* (...), Amsterdam 1991, pp. 89–106.
—, *Kerkidas*, RE XI 1, 1921, coll. 294–308.
Gerson, Lloyd P., *God and Greek Philosophy. Studies in the Early History of Natural Theology*, London-New York 1990 (Issues in Ancient Philosophy).
Geske, Norbert, *Nikias und das Volk von Athen im Archidamischen Krieg*, Stuttgart 2005 (Historia Einzelschriften 186).
Geyer, Fritz, *Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euboia*, I: *Bis zum peloponnesischen Krieg*, in *Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie* 6, 1903.
Giannantoni, Gabriele, *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae*. Collegit, disposuit, apparatibus notisque instruxit, IV, Napoli 1990 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 18).
—, *L'ateismo*, in Vegetti, Mario (ed.), *Introduzione alle culture antiche*, vol. 3: *L'esperienza religiosa antica*, Torino 1992, pp. 208–228.
—, *Epicuro e l'ateismo antico*, in *idem*, Gigante, Marcello (ed.), *Epicureismo greco e romano*. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Napoli, 19–26 maggio 1993, Napoli 1996 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 25), pp. 21–63.
Gigante, Marcello, *Filodemo tra poesia e prosa (A proposito di POxy 3724)*, SIFC ser. 3, vol. 7, 1989, pp. 129–151.
Gigon, Olof, *Die Theologie der Vorsokratiker*, in *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1954 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 1), pp. 127–155.
—, *Atheismus*, in *Lexikon der alten Welt*, Zürich-Stuttgart 1965, pp. 370–371.

—, *Die antike Kultur und das Christentum*, Gütersloh 1966.
—, *Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie. Vom Hesiod bis Parmenides*, Basel- Stuttgart [2]1968.
—, *Sokrates. Sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, Bern-München [2]1979.
—, *Il libro 'Sugli dèi' di Protagora*," Rivista di storia della filosofia" 40, 1985, pp. 419– 448.
Girardi, Giulio, *Pour une définition de l'athéisme*, *Salesianum* 25, 1963, pp. 47–74.
—, *"Ateismo": precisazioni terminologiche*, in *L'ateismo contemporaneo*, a cura della Facoltà Filosofica della Pontificia Università Salesiana, I: *L'ateismo nella vita e nella cultura contemporanea*, Torino 1967, pp. 8–31.
Gomme, Arnold Wycombe, Andrewes, Antony, Dover, Kenneth, J., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides,* IV–V, Oxford 1970–1981.
Gomperz, Theodor, *Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, I–II, Berlin-Leipzig [4]1922 –[4]1925 (reprint Berlin-New York 1973).
Gossen, Hans, *Linse*, RE Suppl. VIII, 1956, coll. 263–264.
Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile, *Le livre VI de Diogène Laërce: analyse de sa structure et réflexions méthodologiques*, ANRW II 36, 6, 1992, pp. 3880–4048, esp. pp. 3978–3997 (*Les chries du livre VI*).
—, *Le cynisme est-il une philosophie?*, in Dixsaut, Monique (éd.), *Contre Platon*, vol. I: *Le Platonisme dévoilé*, Paris 1993, pp. 273–313.
—, *Les premiers cyniques et la religion*, in *eadem*, Goulet, Richard (éds.), *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements*. Actes du Colloque International du CNRS (Paris, 22–25 juillet 1991), Paris 1993, s. 117–158. English version: *Religion and the Early Cynics*, in Branham, Robert Bracht, Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile (eds), *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 23), pp. 47–80.
—, *Bion*, DNP II, 1997, coll. 689–691.
—, *L'Ascèse cynique. Un commentaire de Diogène Laërce VI 70–71*. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, Paris 2001 (Histoire des Doctrines de l'Antiquité Classique 10).
Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile, López Cruces, Juan Luis, *Cercidas de Mégalopolis*, DPhA II, 1994, pp. 269–281.
Graf, Fritz, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin-New York 1974 (RGVV 33).
—, *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*, Rom 1985 (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 21).
—, *Textes orphiques et rituel bacchique. A propos des lamelles de Pelinna*, in Borgeaud, Philippe (éd.), *Orphisme et Orphée en honneur de Jean Rudhardt,* Genève 1991 (Recherches et Rencontres 3), pp. 87–102.
—, *Greek Mythology. An Introduction*. Translated by Thomas Marier, Baltimore-London 1993.
—, *Der Mysterienprozeß*, in Burckhardt, Leonhard, Ungern-Sternberg, Jürgen von (Hgg.), *Große Prozesse im antiken Athen*, München 2000, pp. 114–127, 270–273.
—, *Plutarch und Götterbilder*, in Hirsch-Luipold, Rainer (Hrsg.), *Gott und Götter bei Plutarch. Gottesbilder-Götterbilder-Weltbilder*, Berlin-New York 2005 (RGVV 54), pp. 251–266.
Graf, Fritz, Johnston, Sarah Iles, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife. Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*, London-New York 2007.
Graf, Georg, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, II, Città del Vaticano 1947 (Studi e testi 133).

Graham, Daniel W., *Explaining the Cosmos. The Ionian Tradition of Scientific Philosophy*, Princeton-Oxford 2006.
—, *The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy. The Complete Fragments and Selected Testimonies* of Major Presocratics. Translated and Edited, Part I–II, Cambridge 2010.
Grant, R.M., *Greek Literature in the Treatise De Trinitate and Cyril Contra Iulianum*, "Journal of Theological Studies" NS 15, 1964, pp. 265–279, esp. pp. 265–269.
Green, Peter, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1 Greek History 480–431 B.C. – the Alternative Version. Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*, Austin, Texas 2006.
Griffith, Mark, *Aristophanes'Frogs,* Oxford 2013 (Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature).
Griffiths, John Gwyn, *The Orders of Gods in Greece and Egypt (According to Herodotus)*, JHS 75, 1955, pp. 21–23.
—, *Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride*. *Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Cardiff 1970.
Gruppe, Otto, *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, I, Leipzig 1887 (reprint Hildesheim-New York 1973).
—, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, I, München 1906.
—, *Herakles*, RE Suppl. III, 1918, coll. 910–1121.
Gudeman, Alfred, *Scholien*, RE II A 1, 1921, coll. 625–705, esp. coll. 672–680 (Aristophanes).
—, *Lysimachos* 20, RE XIV 1, 1928, coll. 32–39.
—, *Symmachos*, RE IV A 1, 1931, coll. 1136–1140.
Gutas, Dimitri, *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation. A Study of the Graeco- Arabic Gnomologia*, New Haven, Conn. 1975 (American Oriental Series 60).
—, *Sayings by Diogenes Preserved in Arabic*, in Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile, Goulet, Richard (éd.), *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements*. Actes du Colloque International du CNRS (Paris, 22–25 juillet 1991), Paris 1993, pp. 475–518.
—, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture. The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbasīd Society (2nd–4th/8th–10th centuries)*, London-New York 1998.
—, *Gnomologien*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Philosophie in der islamischen Welt,* Bd. 1: *8.–10. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. von Ulrich Rudolph unter Mitarbeit Renate Würsch, Basel, 2012, pp. 463–470.
—, *Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, pp. 480–496.
—, *Die Wiedergeburt der Philosophie und die Übersetzungen ins Arabische*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* pp. 55–91.
Guthrie, William Keith Chambers, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, II–III, Cambridge 1965–1969 (Since 1971 vol. III has been published in two parts: *The Sophists* and *Socrates*).
Hall, Edith, *When Did the Trojans Turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15*, ZPE 73, 1988, pp. 15–18.
—, *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*, Oxford 1989.
Halliwell, Stephen, *Ancient Interpretations of* ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν *in Aristophanes*, CQ 34, 1984, pp. 83–88.
—, *Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens*, JHS 111, 1991, pp. 48–70.
Hammer-Jensen, Ingeborg, *Pseudo-Demokrit*, RE Suppl. IV, 1924, coll. 219–223.
Hammerstaedt, Jürgen, *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaus*, Königstein 1988 (Athenäum's Monographien Altertumswissenschaft 188).
—, *Der Kyniker Oenomaus von Gadara*, ANRW II 36, 4, 1990, pp. 2834–2865.
Hansen, Mogens Herman, *Eisangelia. The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Impeachment of Generals and Politicians*, Odense 1975 (Odense University Classical Studies 6).

Hanson, R.P.C., *The Christian Attitude to Pagan Religions up to the Time of Constantine the Great*, ANRW II 23, 2, 1980, pp. 910–973, reprint in *idem*, *Studies in Christian Antiquity*, Edinburgh 1985, pp. 144–229.
Harnack, Adolf, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, TU 28 (NF 13), H. 4, pp. 3–16.
Harrison, Alick Robin Walsham, *The Law of Athens*, II: *Procedure*, Oxford 1971.
Hatzfeld, Jean, *Alcibiade. Étude sur l'histoire d'Athènes à la fin du Ve siècle*, Paris 1951.
Hawes, Greta, *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity*, Oxford 2014.
Heftner, Herbert, *Zur Datierung der Ostrakisierung des Hyperbolos*, "Rivista Storica dell'Antichità" 30, 2000, pp. 27–45.
—, *Alkibiades. Staatsmann und Feldherr*, Darmstadt 2011 (Gestalten der Antike).
Hehn, Victor, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere in ihrem Übergang aus Asien nach Griechenland und Italien sowie in das übrige Europa*, neu herausgegeben von Otto Schrader, Berlin [8]1911 (reprint Hildesheim 1976).
Heidhues, Bernhard, *Über die Wolken des Aristophanes*, Köln 1897 (Beilage zum Programm des Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasiums zu Köln), pp. 1–59.
Heinemann, Isaac, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*, II, Breslau 1928 (reprint Hildesheim 1968).
Heinimann, Felix, *Nomos und Physis. Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts*, Basel 1945 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1) [reprint Darmstadt [5]1987].
Heinze, Richard, *Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz*, RhM 45, 1890, pp. 497–523.
Heitsch, Ernst, *Die Entdeckung der Homonymie*, Wiesbaden 1972 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1972, Nr. 11).
Helm, Rudolf, *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipzig-Berlin 1906 (reprint Hildesheim 1967).
—, *Kynismus*, RE XII 1, 1924, coll. 3–24.
Hemberg, Bengt, *Die Kabiren*, Diss. Uppsala 1950.
Henderson, Jeffrey, *The Dēmos and Comic Competition*, in Winkler, John J., Zeitlin, Froma I. (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, Princeton 1990, pp. 271–313.
—, *Problems in Greek Literary History: The Case of Aristophanes'* Clouds, in Rosen, Ralph M., Farrell, Joseph (eds), *Nomodeiktes. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, Ann Arbor 1993, pp. 591–601.
—, *Aristophanes*, vol. IV: *Frogs*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 2002 (LCL 180).
Henrichs, Albert, *Toward a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise On Piety*, GRBS 13, 1972, pp. 67–98.
—, *Die Kritik der stoischen Theologie im PHerc. 1428*, CrErc 4, 1974, pp. 5–32.
—, *Two Doxographical Notes: Democritus and Prodicus on Religion*, HSCPh 79, 1975, pp. 93–127.
—, *The Atheism of Prodicus*, CrErc 6, 1976, pp. 15–21.
—, *The Eumenides and Wineless Libations in the Derveni Papyrus*, in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*, t. II, Napoli 1984, pp. 255–268.
—, *The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of the Isis Aretalogies*, HSCPh 88, 1984, pp. 139–158.
Henry, Madeleine, *The Derveni Commentator as Literary Critic*, TAPhA 116, 1986, pp. 149– 164.
Hense, Otto, *Bion bei Philo*, RhM 47, 1892, pp. 219–240.

—, *Teletis reliquiae. Recognovit, prolegomena scripsit*, Tübingen ²1909 (reprint Hildesheim-New York 1969), esp. pp. LXXIV–LXXXI ("De Bione Theodoreo").
Hermann, A., *Dardanos*, RAC III, 1957, coll. 593–594.
Herrero de Jáuregui, Miguel, *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, Berlin-New York 2010 (Sozomena 7).
Herzog-Hauser, Gertrud, *Tyche*, RE VII A 2, 1948, coll. 1651–1654.
Hesk, Jon, *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 2000.
Hessler, Jan Erik, *Epikur, Brief an Menoikeus. Edition, Übersetzung, Einleitung und Kommentar*, Basel 2014 (Schwabe Epicurea 4).
Higbie, Carolyn, *Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions*, TAPhA 129, 1999, pp. 43–83.
Hill, D., *Kustā b. Lūkā al Ba'lbakki*, EI² V, 1986, coll. 529b–530a.
Hirzel, Rudolf, *Die Homonymie der griechischen Götter nach der Lehre antiker Theologen*, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wisssenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Cl. 48, 1898, s. 277–337.
Hock, Ronald F., O'Neil, Edward N., *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. I: *The Progymnasmata*, Atlanta, Georgia 1986 (Texts and Translations, 27; Graeco-Roman Religion Series, 9).
Hönscheid, Jürgen, *Didymos der Blinde. De trinitate*, Meisenheim am Glan 1974 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 44).
Hoffmann, Klaus Friedrich, *Das Recht im Denken der Sophistik*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997 (BzA 104).
Höistad, Ragnar, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King. Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*, Diss. Uppsala, Lund 1948.
Holford-Strevens, Leofranc A., *Killing Dead Tyrants (Aristophanes, Birds 1072–5)*, LCM 16, 1991, p. 68.
Hollerbach, Hans Rainer, *Zur Bedeutung des Wortes χρεία*, Diss. Köln 1964.
Hontoir, Camille, *Comment Clément d'Alexandrie a connu les mystères d'Éleusis*, "Le Musée Belge" 9, 1905, pp. 180–188.
Hopfner, Theodor, *Orient und die griechische Philosophie*, Leipzig 1925 (Beihefte zum Alten Orient, 4).
—, *Plutarch über Isis und Osiris*, II, Prag 1941 (Monographien des Archiv Orientální 9).
Hordern, James, *Philodemus and the Poems of Diagoras*, ZPE 136, 2001, pp. 33–38.
Horn, Hans-Jürgen, *Gottesbeweis*, RAC XI, 1981, coll. 951–977.
Horna, Konstantin, Fritz, Kurt von, *Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologien*, RE Supplbd. VI, 1935, coll. 74–90.
Hornblower, Simon, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. III: *Books 5.25–8.109*, Oxford 2008.
Horst, Pieter W. van der, *The First Atheist*, in *idem*, *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context. Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity*, Tübingen 2006 (WUNT 196), pp. 242–249.
Howald, Ernst, AENAOI ΝΕΦΕΛΑΙ, „Sokrates. Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen" 76 (NF 10), 1922, pp. 23–42.
Hubbard, Thomas K., *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*, Ithaca-London 1991.
Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, *Le mouvement des traductions syriaques: arrière-plan historique et sociologique*, in *Entre Orient et Occident: La philosophie et la science gréco-romaines dans le monde arabe*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 2011 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 57), pp. 45–77.
Hussey, Edward, *The Enigmas of Derveni. A Review of André Laks and Glenn W. Most (eds), Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, OSAPh 17, 1999, pp. 303–324.

Ieranò, Giorgio, *Il ditirambo di Dioniso. Le testimonianze antiche*, Pisa-Roma 1997 (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 12).
—, '*One Who Is Fought over by All the Tribes'. The Dithyrambic Poet and the City of Athens*, in Kowalzig, Barbara, Wilson, Peter (eds), *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford 2013, pp. 368–386, esp. pp. 378–383 (on Cinesias).
Irigoin, Jean, *Les manuscrits grecs. II. Nouveaux recueils de fac-similés*, REG 85, 1972, pp. 543–571.
Irwin, Terence, *Classical Thought*, Oxford-New York 1989 (A History of Western Philosophy 1).
Jacoby, Felix, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente,* Berlin 1902 (PhU 16) [reprint 1973].
—, *Euemeros*, RE VI 1, 1907,coll. 952–972, in *idem*, *Griechische Historiker*, Stuttgart 1956, pp. 175–185.
—, *Krateros*, RE XI 2, 1922, coll. 1617–1621.
—, *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford 1949.
—, *Diagoras ὁ Ἄθεος*, Berlin 1959 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen Literatur und Kunst, 1959, 3).
Jaeger, Werner, *Die Theologie der frühen griechischen Denker*, Stuttgart 1953 ([2]1964), esp. pp. 199–216, 296–303,reprint in Classen, Carl Joachim (Hrsg.), *Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976 (WdF 187), pp. 38–66.
Jan, Karl von, *Demokritos aus Chios*, RE V 1, 1903, col. 140.
Janko, Richard, *The Physicist as Hierophant: Aristophanes, Socrates and the Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus*, ZPE 118, 1997, pp. 61–94, esp. pp. 87–92.
—, *The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, Apopyrgizontes Logoi?): A New Translation*, CPh 96, 2001, pp. 1–32, esp. pp. 6–15 ('Diagoras as Poet and Sophist').
—, *The Derveni Papyrus: An Interim Text*, ZPE 141, 2002, pp. 1–62.
—, *God, Science, and Socrates*, BICS 46, 2002–2003, pp. 1–18, esp. pp. 11 ff.
—, *review Betegh*, BMCR 2005.01.27.
—, *Sokrates the Freethinker*, in *A Companion to Socrates*. Edited by Sara Ahbel-Rappe, Rachana Kamtekar, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Carlton 2006, pp. 48–62.
—, *Reconstructing (Again) the Opening of the Derveni Papyrus*, ZPE 166, 2008, pp. 37– 51.
Javierre, Antonio M., *L'ateismo nei Padri della Chiesa*, in *L'ateismo contemporaneo*, a cura della Facoltà Filosofica della Pontificia Università Salesiana, IV: *Il cristianesimo di fronte all'ateismo*, Torino 1970, pp. 21–42.
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse, *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus*, vol. I–II, London [2]1893.
Jiménez San Cristóbal, Ana Isabel, *The Sophoclean Dionysos*, in Bernabé, Alberto *et al.* (ed.), *Redefining Dionysos*, Berlin-Boston 2013 (MythosEikonPoiesis 5), pp. 272– 300.
Joël, Karl, *Der Glaube des Atheisten*, in *idem*, *Antibarbarus. Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Jena 1914, pp. 174–191.
Jourdan, Fabienne, *Le Papyrus de Derveni. Texte présenté, traduit et annoté*, Paris 2003 (Verité des mythes. Sources).
—, *Orphée et les chrétiens. La reception du mythe d'Orphée dans la littérature chrétienne grecque des cinq premiers siècles,* t. I–II, Paris 2010–2011.
—, *Orpheus (Orphik),* RAC XXVI Lief. 205, 2014, coll. 576–613.
Kagan, Donald, *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition*, Ithaca-London 1981.
Kahlos, Maijastina, *Debate and Dialogue. Christian and Pagan Cultures c. 360–430*, Aldershot-Burlington, VT 2007 (Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology and Biblical Studies).

Kahn, Charles, *Greek Religion and Philosophy in the Sisyphus Fragment*, "Phronesis" 42, 1997, pp. 247–263.
—, *Was Euthyphro the Author of the Derveni Papyrus?*, in Laks, André, Most, Glenn W. (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997, pp. 55–63.
Kahrstedt, Ulrich, *Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens*, I: *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*, Stuttgart-Berlin 1934 (reprint Aalen 1969).
Kaiser, Stefan Ikarus, *Die Fragmente des Aristoxenos aus Tarent*. Neu herausgegeben und ergänzt, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2010 (Spudasmata 128).
Kalouche, Fouade, *The Cynic Way of Living*, "Ancient Philosophy" 23, 2003, pp. 181–194.
Kannicht, Richard, *Zum Corpus Euripideum*, in Müller-Goldingen, Christian, Sier, Kurt (Hgg.), *ΛΗΝΑΙΚΑ. Festschrift für Carl Werner Müller zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Januar 1996*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996 (BzA 89), pp. 21–31.
Kapsomenos, Stylianos G., *The Orphic Papyrus Roll of Thessalonika*," Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists " 2, 1964/65, pp. 3–12.
Katz, B.R., *The Birds of Aristophanes and Politics*, "Athenaeum" NS 54, 1976, pp. 353–381.
Keil, Bruno, *Ein neues Bruchstück des Diagoras von Melos*, "Hermes" 55, 1920, pp. 63–67.
Kerferd, George, *The Sophistic Movement*, Cambridge 1981.
Kerferd, George B., Flashar, Hellmut, *Die Sophistik*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. II 1: *Sophistik, Sokrates. Mathematik. Medizin*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Basel 1998, pp. 1–137.
Kern, Otto, *Iakchos*, RE IX 1, 1914, coll. 613–622.
—, *Kabeiros und Kabeiroi*, RE X 2, 1919, coll. 1399–1450, esp. coll. 1423–1437 ('Samothrake').
—, *Die Religion der Griechen*, II, Berlin 1935 (^{2}1963).
Kern, Walter, *Atheismus. Eine philosophiegeschichtliche Information*, "Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie " 97, 1975, pp. 3–40, esp. pp. 6–12 ('Atheismus in der Antike?').
Kidd, Ian Gray, *Posidonius. The Commentary*, vol. I–II, Cambridge 1988 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 14 A-B).
Kienast, Dietmar, *Der innenpolitische Kampf im Athen von der Rückkehr Thukidydes bis zu Perikles'Tod*, "Gymnasium" 60, 1953, pp. 210–229.
Kiessling, Adolf, Heinze, Richard, Q. Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden, Berlin ^{7}1930 (^{11}1964).
Kindstrand, Jan Fredrik, *Bion of Borysthenes. A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary*, Uppsala 1976 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 11).
—, *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 16).
—, *The Cynics and Heraclitus*, "Eranos" 82, 1984, pp. 149–178.
—, *Diogenes Laertius and the Chreia Tradition*, "Elenchos" 7, 1986 (= *Diogene Laerzio storico del pensiero antico*), pp. 217–243.
—, *Gnomica Basileensia*, Uppsala 1991 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 2).
—, *Bion*, DPhA II, 1994, pp. 108–112.
Kingsley, Peter, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, Oxford 1995.
Kirchner, Iohannes, *Prosopographia Attica*, I–II, Berolini 1901–1903 (Berlin ^{2}1966).
Kirk, Geoffrey Stephen, Raven, John Earl, Schofield, Malcolm, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge ^{2}1983.
Klauser, Theodor, *Apophthegma*, RAC I, 1950, coll. 545–547.

Klein, Richard, *Die innenpolitische Gegnerschaft gegen Perikles*, in Wirth, Gerhard (Hrsg.), *Perikles und seine Zeit*, Darmstadt 1979 (WdF 412), pp. 494–533.
Knust, Hermann, *Mittheilungen aus dem Eskurial*, Tübingen 1879 (Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart 141).
Kock, Theodor, *Ausgewählte Komoedien des Aristophanes*, Bd. 3: *Die Frösche*, Berlin [4]1898.
Kock, Theodor, Schroeder, Otto, *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, Bd. 4: *Die Vögel*, Berlin [4]1927.
Körte, Alfred, *Bacchylidea*, "Hermes" 53, 1918, pp. 113–147.
—, *Komödie*, RE XI 1, 1921, coll. 1207–1214.
Konstan, David, *Socrates in Aristophanes'Clouds*, in Morrison, Donald R. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, Cambridge 2011, pp. 75–90.
Kopff, E. Christian, *The Date of Aristophanes, Nubes II*, AJPh 111, 1990, pp. 318–329.
Kouremenos, Theokritos, *Introduction*, in *The Derveni Papyrus*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by *idem*, George M. Parássoglou, Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou, Firenze 2006 (Studi e Testi per il Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini 13), pp. 19–59.
Kraemer, Jörg, *Arabische Homersverse*, ZDMG 106, 1956, pp. 259–316.
Kraus, Manfred, *Parmenides*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer, Georg Rechenauer, Basel 2013, pp. 441–530.
Krech, Paul, *De Crateri ΨΗΦΙΣΜΑΤΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΙ* et de locis aliquot Plutarchi ex ea petitis, Diss. Berlin, Gryphiswaldiae 1888 (reprint Chicago 1970).
Krokiewicz, Adam, *Sokrates*, Warszawa, 1958.
Kroll, Wilhelm, *Bolos und Demokritos*, "Hermes" 69, 1934, pp. 228–232.
—, *Dardanos*, RE Suppl. VI, 1935, coll. 25–26.
Kugelmeister, Christoph, *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten attischen Komödie*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996 (BzA 80).
Kusch, H., *Diogenes*, RAC III, 1957, coll. 1063–1075.
Kyriakidi, Natalia, *Aristophanes und Eupolis. Zur Geschichte einer dichterischen Rivalität*, Berlin-New York 2007 (UaLG 85).
Lämmle, Rebecca, *Das Satyrspiel*, in HGL I, 2011, pp. 611–663.
Lämmli, Franz, *Das attische Prozeßverfahren in seiner Wirkung auf die Gerichtsrede*, Paderborn 1938 (Rhetorische Studien, 20), esp. pp. 17–57 ('Zu Andokides 1 und Pseudo-Lysias 6').
Laks, André, *Diogène d'Apollonie. Édition, traduction et commentaire des fragments et témoignages*. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, Sankt Augustin 2008.
—, *Speculating about Diogenes of Apollonia*, in Curd, Patricia, Graham, Daniel W. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*, Oxford 2008, pp. 353–364.
Laks, André, Saetta Cottone, Rossella (éd.), *Comédie et philosophie. Socrate et les* 'Présocratiques' dans les Nuées d'Aristophane, Paris 2013 (Études de Littérature Ancienne 21).
Laks, André, Most, Glenn W. (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997.
Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon. With Addenda and Corrigenda*, Oxford 1968.
Lampe, Kurt, *The Birth of Hedonism. The Cyrenaic Philosophers and Pleasure as a Way of Life*, Princeton-Oxford 2015.
Lana, Italo, *Diagora di Melo*, Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, T. II, vol. 84, 1949/1950, Torino, 1950, pp. 161–205, reprint under the title *Diagora di Melo e la costituzione di Mantinea* in *idem*, *Studi sul pensiero politico classico*, Napoli 1973, pp. 63–105.

Lanzillotta, Lautaro Roig, *Christian Apologists and Greek Gods*, in Bremmer, Jan N., Erskine, Andrew (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh 2010 (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5), pp. 442–464.

Laqueur, Richard, *Diodorea*, "Hermes" 86, 1958, pp. 257–290.

Laurenti, Renato, *La questione Bolo-Democrito*, in *L'Atomo fra scienza e letteratura*, Genova, 1985 (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale 91), pp. 75–106.

Lavelle, Brian M., *Adikia, the Decree of Kannonos, and the Trial of the Generals*, C&M 39, 1988, pp. 19–41.

Lefkowitz, Mary R., *Was Euripides an Atheist?*, SIFC 3. ser., vol. 5, 1987, pp. 443–459.

—, *'Impiety' and 'Atheism' in Euripides' Dramas*, CQ 39, 1989, pp. 70–82, reprint in Mossman, Judith (ed.), *Euripides*, Oxford 2003 (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), pp. 102–121.

Lehmann, Yves, *Varron théologien et philosophe romain*, Bruxelles 1997 (Collection Latomus 237).

Lehrs, Karl, *Zehngebote für klassische Philologen*, in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften,* hrsg. von Arthur Ludwich, Königsberg 1902, p. 476.

Lemerle, Paul, *Byzantine Humanism. The First Phase. Notes and Remarks on Education and Culture in Byzantium from Its Origins to the 10th Century*. Translated by Helen Lindsay and Ann Moffatt, Canberra 1986 (Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. Byzantina Australiensia 3).

Lendle, Otto, *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von Hekataios bis Zosimos*, Darmstadt 1992.

Lenfant, Dominique, *Rois et tyrans dans le théâtre d'Aristophane*, "Ktèma" 12, 1997, pp. 185–200, esp. pp. 196–199 ('Un reflet de l'actualité politique: menace oligarchique, exploitation démagogique').

—, *Protagoras et son procès d'impiété: peut-on soutenir une thèse et son contraire?*, "Ktèma" 27, 2002, pp. 135–154.

Lénormant, Charles, *Sur les représentations qui avaient lieu dans les mystères d'Éleusis*, "Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres" 24, 1861, pp. 397–410, esp. pp. 405–410 (on Diagoras).

Leo, Friedrich, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*, Leipzig 1901 (reprint Hildesheim 1965).

Lesher, James H., *Xenophanes of Colophon. Fragments. A Text and Translation with a Commentary*, Toronto-Buffalo-London 1992 (Phoenix. Supplementary volume 32)

Lesky, Albin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern-München ^{3}1971.

—, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, Göttingen ^{3}1972 (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft 2).

Leszl, Walter, *Democritus'Works: from Their Titles to Their Contents*, in Brancacci, Aldo, Morel, Pierre-Marie (eds), *Democritus: Science, the Arts, and the Care of the Soul*. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Democritus (Paris, 18–20 September 2003), Leiden-Boston 2007 (Philosophia antiqua 102), pp. 11–76.

Letrouit, Jean, *Bolos de Mendès*, DPhA II, 1994, pp. 133–134.

Lévy, Edmond, *Les Hermocopides: Thucydide VI, 27*, 1, REG 126, 2013, pp. 235–237.

Lewis, David M., *After the Profanation of the Mysteries*, in Badian, Ernst (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on His 75th Birthday*, Oxford 1966, pp. 177–191, reprint in Lewis, David M., *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*. Edited by P.J. Rhodes, Cambridge 1997, pp. 158–172.

Ley, Hermann, *Geschichte der Aufklärung und des Atheismus*, I, Berlin 1966.

Lieberg, Godo, *Die 'theologia tripertita' in Forschung und Bezeugung*, ANRW I 4, 1973, pp. 63–115.
—, *Die Theologia tripertita als Formprinzip antiken Denkens*, RhM 125, 1982, pp. 25–53.
Lipsius, Justus Hermann, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren unter Benutzung des Attischen Prozesses von M.H.E. Meier und G.F. Schoemann dargestellt*, II 1, Leipzig 1908 (reprint Hildesheim 1966).
Lloyd, Alan B, *Herodotus Book II. Commentary 1–98*, Leiden 1976 ([2]1994) [EPRO 43].
Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London [2]1983 (Sather Classical Lectures 41).
Lobeck, Christian August, *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres*, Regimontii Prussorum 1829 (reprint Darmstadt 1961).
Löhr, Gebhard, *Religionskritik in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Methodologische und inhaltliche Vorüberlegungen zu einer religionswissenschaftlichen Darstellung*, "Saeculum" 49, 1998, pp. 1–21.
Löwith, Karl, *Wissen, Glauben und Skepsis*, Göttingen 1956.
Long, Anthony A., Sedley, David N., *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. I-II, Cambridge 1987 (many reprints).
Longo Auricchio, Francesca, Indelli, Giovanni, Del Mastro, Gianluca, *Philodème de Gadare*, DPhA V a, 2012, pp. 334–359.
Longrigg, James, *Death and Epidemic Disease in Classical Athens*, in Hope, Valerie M., Marshall, Eireann (eds), *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*, London-New York 2000, pp. 55–64.
López Cruces, Juan Luis, *Les Méliambes de Cércidas de Mégalopolis. Politique et tradition littéraire*, Amsterdam 1995 (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 32).
Lowe, N.J., *Comedy*, Cambridge 2007 (G&R. New Surveys in the Classics 37).
Lozza, Giuseppe, *Plutarco, De superstitione. Introduzione, testo, traduzione, commento*, Milano 1980.
Ludovici, Carl Günther, *Atheisterey*, in *Nötige Supplemente zu dem Grossen vollständigen (Zedlers) Universallexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, II, Leipzig 1751, pp. 618–628.
Lundon, John, *Σχόλια: Una questione non marginale*, in *Discentibus obvius. Omaggio degli allievi a Domenico Magnino*, Como 1997, pp. 73–86.
Luppe, Wolfgang, *Die Zahl der Konkurrenten an den komischen Agonen zur Zeit des Peloponnesischen Kriegs*, "Philologus" 116, 1972, pp. 53–75.
—, *ἀπεώσθη πάλιν εἰς τοὺς Ληναικούς*, ZPE 46, 1982, pp. 147–159.
—, *Epikureische Mythenkritik bei Philodem-Götterliebschaften in PHerc 243 II und III*, CrErc 14, 1984, pp. 109–124.
—, *Zur angeblichen Nachmittags-Aufführung der Vögel des Aristophanes*, "Eikasmos" 10, 1999, pp. 57–59.
Luria, Salomon, *Democritea. Collegit, emendavit, interpretatus est*, Leninopoli 1970.
Luschnat, Otto, *Thukidydes*, RE Suppl. XII, 1970, coll. 1085–1354.
Luzzatto, Maria Jagoda, *Grecia e Vicino Oriente: tracce della storia di Ahiqar nella cultura greca tra VI e V secolo a.C.*, QS 36, 1992, pp. 5–84.
—, *Ancora sulla 'Storia di Ahiqar'*, QS 39, 1994, pp. 253–275.
Maas, Paul, *Kinesias*, RE XI 1, 1921, coll. 479–481.
—, *Melanippides*, RE XV 1, 1931, coll. 422–423.
—, *Stratonikos*, RE IV A 1, 1931, coll. 326–327.
MacDowell, Douglas Maurice, *Andokides, On the Mysteries. The Text Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Appendixes*, Oxford 1962 (many reprints).
—, *The Law in Classical Athens*, London 1978 (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life).

—, *Aristophanes and Athens. An Introduction to the Plays*, Oxford 1995.
Macleod, Colin W., *Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue*, "Historia" 23, 1974, pp. 385–400, reprint in *idem*, *Collected Essays*, Oxford, 1983, pp. 52–67.
Maehler, Herwig, *Die Scholien der Papyri*, in *La Philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 40), pp. 95–127.
—, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*. Erster Teil: *Die Siegeslieder*. I. *Edition des Textes mit Einleitung und Übersetzung*. II. *Kommentar*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997 (Mnemosyne suppl. 62).
Männlein-Robert, Irmgard, *Griechische Philosophen in Indien? Reisewege zur Weisheit*, "Gymnasium" 116, 2009, pp. 331–357.
Mahieu, Wauthier de, *Les doctrines des athées au Xe livre des Lois de Platon*, „Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire" 41, 1963, pp. 5–24 and 42, 1964, pp.16–47.
Maier, Heinrich, *Sokrates. Sein Werk und seine geschichtliche Stellung*, Tübingen 1913 (reprint Aalen 1964).
Malherbe, Abraham J., *Pseudo Heraclitus, epistle 4: The Divinization of the Wise Man*, JbAC 21, 1978, pp. 42–64.
—, *Self-Definition among Epicureans and Cynics*, in Meyer, Ben F., Sanders, Ed Parish (eds), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. III: *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, London 1982, pp. 46–59, 192–197.
Mango, Cyril, *L'origine de la minuscule*, in *La Paléographie grecque et byzantine,* Paris 21–25 octobre 1974, Paris 1977 (Colloques Internationaux du Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique 449), pp. 175–179.
Mann, Christian, *Die Demagogen und das Volk. Zur politischen Kommunikation im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,* Berlin 2007 (Klio. Beiträge 13).
Mansfeld, Jaap, *The Chronology of Anaxagoras' Athenian Period and the Date of His Trial,* II: *The Plot against Pericles and His Associates*, "Mnemosyne" ser. IV, vol. 33, 1980, pp. 17–95.
—, *Theology*, in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld, Malcolm Schofield, Cambridge 1999, pp. 452–478.
—, *Deconstructing Doxography*, "Philologus" 146, 2002, pp. 277–286.
Mansfeld, Jaap, Runia, David T., *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. I: *The Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997 (Philosophia antiqua 73).
—, Aëtiana. *The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. II: *The Compendium*, Part 1–2, Leiden-Boston 2009 (Philosophia antiqua 114).
—, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. III: *Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Ancient Philosophy*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Philosophia antiqua 118).
Marasco, Gabriele, *I processi d'empietà nella democrazia ateniese*, A&R NS 21, 1976, pp. 113–131.
Mari, Manuela, *Gli studi sul santuario e i culti di Samotracia: prospettive e problemi*, in *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca. Stato degli studi e prospettive della ricerca*. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale Roma, 20–22 maggio 1999. A cura di Sergio Ribichini, Maria Rocchi, Paolo Xella, Roma 2001 (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche. Monografie Scientifiche. Serie Scienze Umane e Sociali), pp. 155–167.
Marianetti, Marie C., *Socratic Mystery-Parody and the Issue of ἀσέβεια in Aristophanes' Clouds*, SO 68, 1993, pp. 5–31.
Marr, J.L., *Andocides'Part in the Mysteries and Hermae Affairs 415 BC*, CQ 65 (NS 21), 1971, pp. 326–338.

Martin, Victor, *Sur la condamnation des athées par Platon au Xe livre des Lois*, "Studia Philosophica. Jahrbuch der Schweizer Philosophischen Gesellschaft" 11, 1951, pp. 103–154.
Mastromarco, Giuseppe, *Guerra peloponnesiaca e agoni comici in Atene*, "Belfagor" 30, 1975, pp. 469–473.
—, *Introduzione a Aristofane*, Bari 1994 (Gli Scrittori 50).
Mastromarco, Giuseppe, Totaro, Pietro, *Aristofane, Commedie*, vol. II, Torino 2006.
Mattingly, Harold B., *What Are the Right Dating Criteria for Fifth- Century Attic Texts?,* ZPE 126, 1999, pp. 117–122.
Mayhew, Robert, *Plato, Laws 10*. Translated with a Commentary, Oxford 2008 (Clarendon Plato Series).
—, *Prodicus the Sophist. Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford 2011.
McGibbon, Donald,*The Religious Thought of Democritus*, "Hermes" 93, 1965, pp. 385–397.
McGlew, J.F., *Politics on the Margins: the Athenian Hetaireiai in 415 B.C.*, "Historia" 48, 1999, pp. 1–22.
McNamee, Kathleen, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt*, American Studies in Papyrology 45, 2007.
Meier, M.H.E., *Diagoras*, in *Allgemeine Encyclopaedie der Wissenschaften und Künste* [...] hrsg. von J.S. Ersch und J.G. Gruber, Erste Section, Th. 24, Leipzig 1833, pp. 439–448.
Meiggs, Russell, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972, esp. pp. 447–458 ('The use and misuse of Diodorus').
Meiggs, Russell, Lewis, David, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Revised Edition, Oxford 1988 ([1]1969).
Meijer, P.A., *Philosophers, Intellectuals and Religion in Hellas*, in Versnel, Hendrik S. (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981 (SGRR 2), pp. 216–263, esp. pp. 216–232 ('Atheism').
—, *Stoic Theology. Proofs for the Existence of the Cosmic God and of the Traditional Gods. Including a Commentary on Cleanthes' Hymn on Zeus*, Delft 2007.
Mejer, Jørgen, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978 (Hermes Einzelschriften 40).
Mensching, Gustav, *Atheismus (religionsgeschichtlich)*, in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Kurt Galling, I, Tübingen, [3]1957, pp. 670–672.
Merkelbach, Reinhold, *Weg mit dir, Herakles, in die Feuershölle !*, ZPE 86, 1991, pp. 41–43.
Merkle, Karl, *Die Sittensprüche der Philosophen „Kitāb ādāb al-falāsifa" von Honein ibn Ishāq in der Überarbeitung des Muhammed ibn 'Alī al-Ansāri*, Diss. München 1910, Leipzig 1921.
Mette, Hans Joachim, *Euripides*, „Lustrum" 19, 1976 [1978], esp. pp. 67–70 („Sisyphos").
—, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland*, Berlin-New York, 1977 (Texte und Kommentare 8).
—, *Euripides*, "Lustrum" 23/24, 1981/1982, esp. pp. 238–241 ('Sisyphos').
Meyer, Eduard, *Geschichte des Altertums*, IV 1, Basel [5]1954.
Michaelis, Wilhelm, *De origine indicis deorum cognominum*, Diss. Berlin 1898.
Mikalson, Jon D., *Athenian Popular Religion*, Chapel Hill-London 1983.
—, *Religion and the Plague in Athens 431–423 BC*, in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday*, Durham, N.C. 1984 (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs 10), pp. 217–225.
—, *Greek Popular Religion in Greek Philosophy*, Oxford 2010.
Miltner, Franz, *Perikles*, RE XIX 1, 1937, coll. 748–790.

Möllendorff, Peter von, *Aristophanes*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2002 (Studienbücher Antike 10).

Moles, John L., *The Cynics and Politics*, in Laks, André, Schofield, Malcolm (eds), *Justice and Generosity. Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy. Proceedings oft the Sixth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 129–158.

Momigliano, Arnaldo, *Il razionalismo di Ecateo di Mileto*, A &R NS 12, fasc. 3, 1931, pp. 133–142, reprint in *idem*, *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, I, Roma 1966 (Storia e letteratura 108), pp. 323–333.

Montanari, Franco, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden-Boston 2015.

Montano, Aniello, *La genesi della credenza religiosa secondo Democrito*, "Elenchos" 5, 1984, pp. 365–390.

Montano, Fausto, *The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora*, in Montanari, Franco, Pagani, Lara (eds), *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Berlin-New York 2011 (Trends in Classics. Supplementary Volumes 9), pp. 105–161.

Montuori, Mario, *Socrates. An Approach*, Amsterdam 1988 (Philosophica 2).

—, *The Socratic Problem. The History – the Solutions. From the 18th Century to the Present Time 61 Extracts from 54 Authors in the Historical Context*, Amsterdam 1992 (Philosophica 4). See review of M. Winiarczyk in "Gnomon" 69, 1997, pp. 67–70.

Moraux, Paul, *Diogène Laërce et le Peripatos*, "Elenchos" 7, 1986 (= *Diogene Laerzio storico del pensiero antico*), pp. 245–294.

Morrison, James V., *Historical Lessons in the Melian Episode*, TAPhA 130, 2000, pp. 119– 148, reprint in *idem*, *Reading Thucydides*, Columbus, Ohio 2006, pp. 81–99, 222–232.

Morrow, Glenn Raymond, *Plato's Cretan City. A Historical Interpretation of the Laws*, Princeton 1960 (Princeton 1993 with the foreword by Charles H. Kahn), esp. pp. 470–496 ('The law against impiety').

Mosshammer, Alden, A., *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*, Lewisburg-London 1979.

Mounier, Daniel Ludovicus, *Disputatio philosophico-literaria de Diagora Melio*, Diss. Lugduni Batavorum, Roterodami 1838.

Müller, Carl Werner, *Protagoras über die Götter*, "Hermes" 95, 1967, pp. 140–159, reprint in Classen, Carl Joachim (Hrsg.), *Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976 (WdF 187), pp. 312–340.

—, *Zur Frühgeschichte der erzählenden Prosaliteratur der Antike*, in *idem*, *Legende-Novelle-Roman. Dreizehn Kapitel zur erzählenden Prosaliteratur der Antike*, Göttingen 2006, pp. 1–54.

Müller-Strübing, Hermann, *Protagorea. Zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes*, "Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik" 121, 1880, pp. 81–106.

Münchenberg, Theodorus, *De Diagora Melio*, Diss. Halle, 1877.

Münzer, Friedrich, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin 1897.

Muir, John Victor, *Religion and the New Education: The Challenge of the Sophists*, in Easterling, Patricia Elizabeth, Muir, John Victor (eds), *Greek Religion and Society*, with a foreword by Moses Finley, Cambridge 1985, pp. 191–218, 228–230.

Murray, Oswyn, *The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking* Group, in *idem*, *Sympotica. A Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford 1990, pp. 149–161.

Musti, Domenico, *Aspetti della religione dei Cabiri*, in *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca. Stato degli studi e prospettive della ricerca*. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale Roma, 20–22 maggio 1999. A cura di Sergio Ribichini, Maria Rocchi, Paolo Xella, Roma 2011 (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche. Monografie Scientifiche. Serie Scienze Umane e Sociali), pp. 141–154.

Muth, Robert, *Studien zu Platons 'Nomoi' X, 885 b 2 – 899 d 3*, WSt 69, 1956 (Festschrift Albin Lesky), pp. 140–153.

Mylonopoulos, Joannis, *Divine Images versus Cult Images. An Endless Story about Theories, Methods, and Terminologies*, in *idem* (ed.), *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (RGRW 170), pp. 1–19.

Natorp, Paul, *Diogenes von Sinope*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 765–773.

Navia, Luis E., *Diogenes of Sinope. The Man in the Tub*, Westport, Connecticut-London 1998 (Contributions in Philosophy 67).

Nenci, Giuseppe, *Ecateo da Mileto e il suo razionalismo*, Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, serie 8, vol. 6, 1951, pp. 51–58.

Nestle, Wilhelm, *Euripides. Der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung*, Stuttgart 1901 (reprint Aalen 1969).

—, *Kritias. Eine Studie*, NJA 11, 1903, pp. 81–107, 178–199, reprint in *idem*, *Griechische Studien*, pp. 253–320.

—, *Die griechische Religiosität in ihren Grundzügen und Hauptvertretern von Homer bis Proklos*, Bd. II: *Griechische Religiosität vom Zeitalter des Perikles bis auf Aristoteles*, Berlin-Leipzig 1933 (Sammlung Göschen 1066).

—, *Die Horen des Prodikos*, "Hermes" 71, 1936, pp. 151–170, reprint in *idem*, *Griechische Studien*, pp. 403–429 and Classen, Carl Joachim (Hrsg.), *Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976 (WdF 187), pp. 425–451.

—, *Legenden vom Tod der Gottesverächter*, ARW 33, 1936, pp. 246–269, reprint in *idem*, *Griechische Studien*, pp. 567–596.

—, *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates*, Stuttgart ^{2}1942 (reprints in Aalen 1966 and Stuttgart 1975).

—, *Griechische Studien. Untersuchungen zur Religion, Dichtung und Philosophie der Griechen*, Stuttgart 1948 (reprint Aalen 1968).

—, *Asebieprozesse*, RAC I, 1950, coll. 735–740.

—, *Atheismus*, RAC I, 1950, coll. 866–870.

Newiger, Hans-Joachim, *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes*, München 1957 (Zetemata 16). [2., unveränderte Auflage, Stuttgart-Weimar 2000 (Drama. Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 10)].

Newiger, Hans-Joachim (Hrsg.), *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie*, Darmstadt 1975 (WdF 265).

Nilsson, Martin Persson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, I–II, München ^{3}1967–^{3}1974 (HdA V 2).

Nock, Arthur Darby, *review of Bidez,Cumont, Les mages hellénisés*, JRS 30, 1940, pp. 191–198, reprint in *idem*, *Essays on Religion*, pp. 516–526.

—, *review of W. Otto, H. Bengtson*, AJPh 63, 1942, pp. 217–224, reprint in *idem*, *Essays on Religion*, pp. 551–558.

—, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. by Zeph Stewart, II, Oxford 1972 (reprint Oxford, 1986).

Noethlichs, Karl Leo, *Heidenverfolgung*, RAC XIII 1986, coll. 1149–1190.

Nünlist, René, *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge 2009.

Obbink, Dirk, *The Atheism of Epicurus*, GRBS 30, 1989, pp. 187–223.

—, *A Quotation of the Derveni Papyrus in Philodemus'On Piety*, CrErc 24, 1994, pp. 111– 136.

—, *How to Read Poetry about Gods*, in *idem* (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry. Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*, New York-Oxford 1995, pp. 189–209.

—, *Philodemus, On Piety Part 1. Critical Text with Commentary*, Oxford 1996.
—, *Cosmology as Initiation vs. Critique of the Orphic Mysteries*, in Laks, André, Most, Glenn W. (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997, pp. 39–54.
Olson, S.Douglas, *Broken Laughter. Select Fragments of Greek Comedy. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation*, Oxford 2007.
Opelt, Ilona, *Die griechische Philosophie bei den Arabern*, München 1970 (Tusculum Schriften).
—, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin*, Heidelberg 1980 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften NF, 2. Reihe, 63).
Osborne, Robin, *The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai*, PCPhS 211 (NS 31), 1985, pp. 47–73, reprint in *idem*, *Athens and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 2010, pp. 341– 367.
Ostwald, Martin, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law. Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1986.
O'Sullivan, Patrick, *Sophistic Ethics, Old Atheism, and "Critias" on Religion*, "Classical World" 105, 2012, pp. 167–185.
Otto, Rudolf, *Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*, Breslau 1917 (many editions).
Otto, Walter, Bengtson, Hermann, *Zur Geschichte des Niedergangs des Ptolemäerreiches*, München 1938 (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abt. NF 17, 1938).
Overvien, Oliver, *Hunayn b. Ishāq, Ādāb al-falāsifa: Griechische Inhalte in einer arabischen Spruchsammlung*, in Piccione, Rosa Maria, Perkams, Matthias (ed.), *Selecta colligere, I. Akten des Kolloquiums „Sammeln, Neuordnen, Neues Schaffen. Methoden der Überlieferung von Texten in der Spätantike und in Byzanz" (Jena, 21.–23. November 2002)*, Alessandria 2003 (Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica 11), pp. 95–115.
—, *Die Sprüche des Kynikers Diogenes in der griechischen und arabischen Überlieferung*, Stuttgart 2005 (Hermes Einzelschriften 92). See review of M. Winiarczyk in „Eos" 95, 2008, pp. 123–130.
Packmohr, August, *De Diogenis Sinopensis apophthegmatis* (sic !) *quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Münster 1913.
Papadopoulou, Ioanna, Muellner, Leonard (eds), *Poetry as Initiation. The Center for Hellenic Studies Symposium on the Derveni Papyrus,* Washington 2014 (Hellenic Studies 63).
Parker, Robert, *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1983 (reprint with a new preface Oxford 1996).
—, *Early Orphism*, in Powell, Anton (ed.), *The Greek World*, London-New York 1995, pp. 483–510.
—, *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford 1996.
—, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford 2005.
Parmentier, Léon, *Traité d'Isis et d'Osiris de Plutarque*, Bruxelles 1913 (Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoires. Deuxième série. Tome XI 1), esp. pp. 15–20 ('L'interprétation des Phrygia Grammata').
Passow, Franz, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, I 2, Leipzig ^{2}1847.
Patzer, Andreas (Hrsg.), *Der historische Sokrates*, Darmstadt 1987 (WdF 585).
Pechstein, Nikolaus, *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998 (BzA 115).

Pecorella Longo, Chiara, *"Eterie" e gruppi politici nell' Atene del IV sec. a. C.*, Firenze 1971 (Università di Padova. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia 48), esp. pp. 41–51 („Il processo contro Andocide e il suo sfondo politico").

Peglau, Markus, *Varro, ein Antiquar zwischen Tradition und Aufklärung*, in Haltenhoff, Andreas *et al.* (Hgg.), *O tempora, o mores. Römische Werte und römische Literatur in den letzten Jahrzehnten der Republik*, München-Leipzig 2003 (BzA 171), pp. 137–164.

Pellat, Charles, *Arabische Geisteswelt. Ausgewählte und übersetzte Texte von al- Ǧāhiz (777–869)*. Unter Zugrundelegung der arabischen Originaltexte aus dem französischen übertragen von Walter W. Müller, Zürich-Stuttgart 1967 (Bibliothek des Morgenlandes).

Pelling, Christopher, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*, London-New York 2000.

Pépin, Jean, *Mythe et allégorie. Les origins grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Nouvelle edition, revue et augmentée, Paris 1976.

Perilli, Lorenzo, *La teoria del vortice nel pensiero antico. Dalle origini a Lucrezio*, Ospedaletto 1996 (Supplementi di 'Museum Criticum').

Pfeiffer, Rudolf, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968 (many reprints).

Pfister, Friedrich, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, I–II, Gießen 1909–1912 (RGVV, Bd. V 1–2) [reprint Berlin-New York 1974].

—, *Ein apokrypher Alexanderbrief. Der sogenannte Leon von Pela und die Kirchenväter*, in *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, Münster 1964 (JbAC Ergbd. 1), pp. 291–297, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften zum Alexanderroman*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 61), pp. 104–111.

Pfligersdorffer, Georg, *Λόγιος und die λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι bei Demokrit*, WSt 61/62, 1943/1947, pp. 5–49.

Philippson, Robert, *Philodemos*, RE XIX 2, 1938, coll. 2444–2482, reprint in *idem*, *Studien zu Epikur und den Epikureern*, im Anschluss an Wolfgang Schmid hrsg. von Carl Joachim Classen, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1983, pp. 229–248.

Phillips, David D., *The Law of Ancient Athens*, Ann Arbor 2013, esp. pp. 407–462 ("Impiety").

Piccirilli, Luigi, *Il primo caso di autodafé letterario: il rogo dei libri di Protagora*, SIFC 90, 1997, pp. 17–23.

Pickard-Cambridge, Arthur Wallace, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford ^{2}1962.

—, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Second Edition Revised by John Gould and David M. Lewis, Oxford 1968 (Reissued with supplement and correction 1988 [Select Addenda pp. 359–365]).

Pietruschka, Ute, *Das Corpus der arabischen und syrischen Gnomologien. Ein Arbeitsbericht*, in Tamcke, Martin, Grebenstein, Sven (Hgg.), *Geschichte, Theologie und Kultur des syrischen Christentums. Beiträge zum 7. Deutschen Syrologie-Symposium in Göttingen, Dezember 2011*, Wiesbaden 2014 (Syriaca 46), pp. 291–302.

Pippin, Anne, *The Demioprata of Pollux X*, "Hesperia" 25, 1956, pp. 318–328.

Pohlenz, Max, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, I–II, Göttingen 1948–1949 (^{5}1980).

—, *Nomos und Physis*, "Hermes" 81, 1953, pp. 418–438, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von Heinrich Dörrie, II, Hildesheim 1965, pp. 341–360.

—, *Die griechische Tragödie – Erläuterungen*, Göttingen ^{2}1954.

Pouderon, Bernard, *Athénagore d'Athènes. Philosophe chrétien*, Paris 1989 (Theologie Historique 82).

Powell, Anton, *Athens and Sparta. Constructing Greek Political and Social History from 478 BC*, London-New York ^{2}2001.

Powers, Nathan, *Plato's Cure for Impiety in Laws*, "Ancient Philosophy" 34, 2014, pp. 47– 64.

Praechter, Karl, *Die Philosophie des Altertums*. Zwölfte, umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, Berlin ^{12}1926 (reprint Basel-Stuttgart ^{14}1957) [Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, Erster Teil].

Preisendanz, Karl, *Pibechis*, RE XX 1, 1941, coll. 1310–1312.
Price, Simon, *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*, Cambridge 1999 (Key Themes in Ancient History).
Pritchett, William Kendrick, *The Attic Stelai, Part I–II*, "Hesperia" 22, 1953, pp. 225–299 and "Hesperia" 25, 1956, pp. 178–317.
—, *Five New Fragments of the Attic Stelai*, "Hesperia" 30, 1961, pp. 23–29.
Quinn, Josephine Crawley, *Herms, Kouroi and the Political Anatomy of Athens*, G&R 54, 2007, pp. 82–105.
Raaflaub, Kurt, *Den Olympier herausfordern? Prozesse im Umkreis des Perikles*, in Burckhardt, Leonhard, Ungern-Sternberg, Jürgen von (Hgg.), *Große Prozesse im antiken Athen*, München 2000, pp. 96–113, 266–270.
Rahner, Karl, *Atheismus*, in *Sacramentum Mundi. Theologisches Lexikon für die Praxis*, hrsg. von *idem et al*., I, Freiburg im Breisgau 1968, pp. 372–383.
Rapisarda, Emanuele, *Clemente fonte di Arnobio*, Torino 1939.
Raubitschek, Antony Erich, *War Melos tributpflichtig?*, "Historia" 12, 1963, pp. 78–82.
Rechenauer, Georg, *Götter und Atome bei Demokrit*, in *idem* (Hrsg.), *Frühgriechisches Denken*, Göttingen 2005, pp. 384–406.
—, *Diogenes aus Apollonia*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer, Georg Rechenauer, Basel 2013, pp. 811–832
—, *Leukipp und Demokrit*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1 (…), pp. 833–946.
Reichel, Michael, *Zum literarischen und historischen Hintergrund von Bakchylides 3*, in Bagordo, Andreas, Zimmermann, Bernhard (Hgg.), *Bakchylides. 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, München 2000 (Zetemata 106), pp. 147–159.
Reimmann, Jacob Friedrich, *Historia universalis atheismi et atheorum falso et merito suspectorum apud Iudaeos, Ethnicos, Christianos, Muhammedanos, ordine chronologico descripta et a suis initiis usque ad nostra tempora deducta*, Hildesiae 1725 (Mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben von Winfried Schröder, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1992 [Philosophische Clandestina der deutschen Aufklärung: Abt. 2, Supplementa; Bd. 1]).
Reinhardt, Leopold, *Die Quellen von Ciceros Schrift De natura deorum*, Diss. Breslau 1888 (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, III 2).
Reitzenstein, Richard, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten griechischen Texten der Straßburger Bibliothek*, Straßburg 1901.
—, *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig 1904 (reprint Stuttgart 1969).
Renehan, Robert, *Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones,* Göttingen 1975 (Hypomnemata 45).
Reverdin, Olivier, *La religion de la cité platonicienne*, Paris 1945 (École Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires 6), esp. pp. 208–241 ('Les lois contre l'impiété et le vol sacrilège').
Reynolds, Leighton Durham, Wilson, Nigel Guy, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford ^{3}1991 (^{4}2013).
Rhodes, Peter John, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford 1972.
—, *The Athenian Code of Laws, 410–399 B.C.,* JHS 111, 1991, pp. 87–100.
—, *The Ostracism of Hyperbolus*, in Osborne, Robin, Hornblower, Simon (eds), *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford 1994, pp. 85–98.
Rich, A.N.M., *The Cynic Conception of AYTAPKEIA*, "Mnemosyne" 9, 1956, pp. 23–29, reprint in Billerbeck, Margarethe (Hrsg.), *Die Kyniker in der modernen Forschung* (…), Amsterdam 1991, pp. 233–239.

Richard, Marcel, *Florilèges grecs*, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* V, 1964, coll. 475–512, reprint in *idem*, *Opera Minora*, I, Turnhout-Leuven 1976 (no. 1, without separate pagination).
Richardson, L.J.D., *TEPΘPEIA*, CQ 39, 1945, pp. 59–62.
Riedweg, Christoph, *The 'Atheistic' Fragment from Euripides' Bellerophontes (286 [2]N)*, ICS 15, 1990, pp. 39–53.
—, *Orphisches bei Empedokles*, A&A 41, 1995, pp. 34–59.
Rives, James B., *Phrygian Tales*, GRBS 45, 2005, pp. 223–244.
Robertson, Noel, *The Law of Athens, 410–399 B.C.: The Evidence for Review and Publication*, JHS 110, 1990, pp. 43–75.
Röck, Hubert, *Aristophanischer und geschichtlicher Sokrates*, AGPh 25, 1912, pp. 175–195.
Röhricht, Alexander, *De Clemente Alexandrino Arnobii in irridendo gentilium cultu deorum auctore*, Diss. Kiel, Hamburg 1892.
Rohde, Erwin, *Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas. Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der litterarhistorischen Forschung der Griechen*, RhM 33, 1878, pp. 161–220, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, I: *Beiträge zur Chronologie, Quellenkunde und Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, Tübingen-Leipzig 1901, pp. 114–184.
Rolfes, Helmuth, *Atheismus/Theismus*, in *Neues Handbuch Theologischer Grundbegriffe*, hrsg. von Peter Eicher, I, München, 2005, pp. 100–116.
Romer, Frank E., *Atheism, Impiety and the Limos Mēlios in Aristophanes'Birds*, AJPh 115, 1994, pp. 351–365.
—, *Diagoras the Melian (Diod. Sic. 13.6.7)*, "Classical World" 89, 1996, pp. 393–401.
Romilly, Jacqueline de, *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*. Translated by Janet Lloyd, Oxford 1992.
Rosenmeyer, Thomas G., *Notes on Aristophanes' "Birds"*, AJPh 93, 1972, pp. 223–238.
Rosenthal, Franz, *Arabische Nachrichten über Zenon den Eleaten*, Orientalia NS 6, 1937, pp. 21–67, reprint in *idem*, *Greek Philosophy*, pp. 21–67 (no. I without separate pagination).
—, *Sayings of the Ancients from Ibn Durayd's Kitāb al-Mujtanā*, *Orientalia* NS 27, 1958, pp. 29–54, 150–183, reprint in *idem*, *Greek Philosophy*, pp. 29–54, 150–183 (no. VII without separate pagination).
—, *Al-Mubashshir ibn Fātik. Prolegomena to an Abortive Edition*, *Oriens* 13/14, 1960/1961, pp. 132–158.
—, *Greek Philosophy in the Arab World. A Collection of Essays*, Aldershot 1990 (Collected Studies Series 322).
—, *The Classical Heritage in Islam*. Translated from the German by Emile and Jenny Marmorstein, London-New York 1992 (Arabic Thought and Culture) [[1]1975]. German version: *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam*, Zürich-Stuttgart 1965.
Rosivach, Vincent J., *The Tyrant in Athenian Democracy*, QUCC NS 30, 1988, pp. 43–57.
—, *review Cavanaugh*, BMCR 1997.2.22
Rubel, Alexander, *Stadt in Angst. Religion und Politik in Athen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges*, Darmstadt 2000.
—, *Fear and Loathing in Ancient Athens. Religion and Politics during the Peloponnesian War*, Durham 2014.
Rudberg, Gunnar, *Forschungen zu Poseidonios*, Uppsala-Leipzig 1918 (Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, XX 3).
—, *Zum Diogenes-Typos*, SO 15, 1936, pp. 1–18, reprint in Billerbeck, Margarethe (Hrsg.), *Die Kyniker in der modernen Forschung* (...), Amsterdam 1991, pp. 127–143.
Rudhardt, Jean, *La définition du délit d'impiété d'après la legislation attique*, MH 17, 1960, pp. 87–105.

—, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*, Paris ²1992 (Antiquité. Synthèses 3).

Rückert, Birgit, *Die Herme im öffentlichen und privaten Leben der Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Funktion der griechischen Herme als Grenzmal, Inschriftenträger und Kultbild des Hermes*, Regensburg 1998 (Theorie und Forschung 563. Religionswissenschaften 4).

Rüpke, Jörg, *Varro's tria genera theologiae. Religious Thinking in the Late Republic*, "Ordia Prima" 4, 2005, pp. 107–129.

—, *Varro's tria genera theologiae: Crossing Antiquarianism and Philosophy*, in *idem*, *Religion in Republican Rome. Rationalization and Ritual Change*, Philadelphia 2012, pp. 172–185.

Runia, David Theunis, *Atheists in Aëtius. Text, Translation and Comments on De Placitis 1.7.1–10*, "Mnemosyne" 49, 1996, pp. 542–576, reprint in Mansfeld, Jaap, Runia, David T., *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. III: *Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Ancient Philosophy*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Philosophia antiqua 118), pp. 343–373.

—, *What Is Doxography?*, in *Ancient Histories of Medicine. Essays in Medical Doxography and Historiography in Classical Antiquity*, Edited by Philip J. van der Eijk, Leiden-Boston-Köln 1999 (Studies in Ancient Medicine 20), pp. 33–55.

—, *Aëtius, or What's in a Name?*, "Mnemosyne" 62, 2009, pp. 464–470, reprint in Mansfeld, Jaap, Runia David T., *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. III (...), pp. 173–180.

Russo, Joseph, *Prose Genres for the Performance of Traditional Wisdom in Ancient Greece: Proverb, Maxim, Apophthegm*, in Edmunds, Lowell, Wallace, Robert W. (eds), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore-London 1997, pp. 49–64.

Rusten, Jeffrey, *Pellaeus Leo*, AJPh 101, 1980, pp. 197–201.

—, *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, Opladen 1982 (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderreihe: Papyrologica Coloniensia 10).

—, *Interim Notes on the Papyrus from Derveni*, HSCPh 89, 1985, pp. 121–140.

Sacks, Kenneth S., *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton 1990.

—, *Diodorus and His Sources: Conformity and Creativity*, in Hornblower, Simon (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, pp. 213–232.

Sanders, Lionel Jehuda, *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*, London-New York- Sydney 1987.

Sandvoss, Ernst, *Asebie und Atheismus im klassischen Zeitalter der griechischen Polis*, „Saeculum" 19, 1968, pp. 312–329.

Santoni, Anna, *Palefato, Storie incredibili*, Pisa 2000.

—, *Palaiphatos*, DPhA V a, 2012, pp. 85–89.

Sartori, Franco, *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese del VI e V secolo A.C.,* Roma 1957 (Università degli Studi di Padova. Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Storia Antica 3).

Saunders, Trevor J., *Plato's Penal Code. Tradition, Controversy, and Reform in Greek Penology*, Oxford 1991, esp. pp. 301–323 ("Impiety").

Savon, Hervé, *L'athéisme jugé par les chrétiens des premiers siècles*, "Problèmes d'Histoire du Christianisme" 16, 1986, pp. 11–24.

Sayre, Farrand, *Diogenes of Sinope. A Study of Greek Cynicism*, Baltimore 1938.

Schachermeyr, Fritz, *Religionspolitik und Religiosität bei Perikles. Voruntersuchungen zu einer Monographie über Perikles und seine Zeit*, Wien 1968 (SÖAW, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 258, 3).

Schäfer, Christian, *Xenophanes von Kolophon. Ein Vorsokratiker zwischen Mythos und Philosophie*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996 (BzA 77).

Scheer, Tanja S., *Dardanos*, DNP III, 1997, coll. 319–320.
—, *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild. Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik,* München 2000 (Zetemata 105).
Scheler, Max, *Vom Ewigen im Menschen*. Sechste durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage, hrsg. von Manfred S. Frings, Bern 2000 (Gesammelte Werke, Bd. 5).
Schiappa, Edward, *Protagoras and Logos. A Study in Greek Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Columbia, South Carolina [2]2003 (Studies in Rhetoric/Communication).
Schippers, Jacobus Wilhelmus, *De ontwikkeling der euhemeristische godencritiek in de christelijke latijnse literatuur*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen-Djakarta 1952.
Schirren, Thomas, Rechenauer, Georg, *Biographie*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer, Georg Rechenauer, Basel 2013, pp. 175–215.
Schlesier, Renate, *Héraclès et la critique des dieux chez Euripide*, ASNP ser. 3, vol. 15, 1985, pp. 7–40.
Schmalzriedt, Egidius, *ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ. Zur Frühgeschichte der Buchtitel*, München 1970.
Schmid, Wilhelm, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I 4–5, München 1946 –1948 (HdA VII 1, 4–5).
Schmid, Wilhelm, Stählin, Otto, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, II 1, München [6]1920.
Schmid, Wolfgang, *Epikur*, RAC V, 1962, coll. 681–819.
Schmidt, Ernst Günther, *Demokrit und die östliche Welt*, in *idem*, *Erworbenes Erbe. Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrer Nachwirkung*, Leipzig 1988, pp. 218–244.
Schneider, Carl, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, Bd. I–II, München 1967.
Schneidewin, Friedrich Wilhelm, *Heraclidis Politiarum quae exstant*, Gottingae 1847.
Schoedel, William R., *Athenagoras, Legatio and De resurrectione*. Edited and Translated, Oxford 1972 (Oxford Early Christian Texts).
Schöpsdau, Klaus, *Platon, Nomoi (Gesetze) Buch VIII–XII. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen 2011 (Platon, Werke IX 2).
Scholten, Helga, *Die Sophistik. Eine Bedrohung für die Religion und Politik der Polis?*, Berlin 2003.
Schröder, Winfried, *Ursprünge des Atheismus. Untersuchungen zur Metaphysik-Religionskritk des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1998 (Quaestiones 11).
Schubert, Charlotte, *Die Macht des Volkes und die Ohnmacht des Denkens. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mentalität und Wissenschaft im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1993 (Historia Einzelschriften 77).
—, *Perikles*, Darmstadt 1994 (Erträge der Forschung 285).
Schwartz, Eduard, *Diodoros*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 663–704, reprint in *idem*, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*. Herausgegeben von der Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte bei der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Leipzig 1959, pp. 35–97.
Schwarze, Joachim, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie und ihre historische und historiographische Bedeutung*, München 1971 (Zetemata 51).
Schwenn, Friedrich, *Kybele*, RE XI, 1922, coll. 2250–2298.
Scodel, Ruth, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, Göttingen 1980 (Hypomnemata 60).
Seaman, Michael G., *The Athenian Expedition to Melos in 416 B.C.*, „Historia" 46, 1997, pp. 385–418.
Searby, Denis Michael, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*, Uppsala 1998 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 19).

Sedley, David, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*, Cambridge 1998.
—, *The Atheist Underground*, in Harte, Verity, Lane, Melissa (eds), *Politeia in Greek and Roman Philosophy*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 329–348.
Segonds, Alain-Philippe, *Les Fragments de* l'Histoire de la Philosophie, in Porphyre, *Vie de Pythagore. Lettre à Marcella*. Texte établi et traduit par Edouard des Places, Paris 1982 (Collection G. Budé), pp. 169–176.
Severyns, Albert, *Bacchylide. Essai biographique*, Liège-Paris 1933 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 56).
Sezgin, Fuat, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, III,V, Leiden 1970–1974.
Sfameni Gasparro, Giulia, *Misteri e culti misterici di Demetra*, Roma 1986.
Shakhnovich, M.M., *Диагор Мелосский – античный критик религии*, in: Филиппова, Р. Ф. (ред.), *Проблемы религиеведения и атеизма в музеях*, Ленинград 1989, pp. 130–143.
Sider, David, *The Epigrams of Philodemos. Introduction, Text and Commentary*, New York-Oxford 1997.
Siébert, Gérard, *Hermes*, LIMC V 1, 1990, pp. 285–387, esp. pp. 295–306 ('Le pilier Hermaïque'), pp. 374–378 ('Problèmes du pilier hermaïque').
Simon, Erika, *Iakchos*, LIMC V 1, 1990, pp. 612–614.
Simpson, Adelaide D., *Epicureans, Christians, Atheists in the Second Century*, TAPhA 72, 1941, pp. 372–381.
Sitte, Alfons, *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius*, Diss. Wien 1970 (typescript).
Sittl, Karl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, III, München 1887.
Sitzler, Jakob, *Jahresbericht über die griechischen Lyriker (mit Ausnahme Pindars),* "Bursians Jahresbericht" 133, 1907, pp. 104–322.
Skydsgaard, Jens Erik, *Varro the Scholar. Studies in the First Book of Varro' s De rustica*, Hafniae, 1968 (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 4 Supplementum).
Smarczyk, Bernhard, *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund*, München 1990 (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 5).
Snell, Bruno, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*, Göttingen ^{5}1980.
Solmsen, Friedrich, *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1979 (Martin Classical Lectures 25).
Sommerstein, Alan H., *The Decree of Syrakosios*, CQ NS 36, 1986, pp. 101–108.
—, *Aristophanes, The Comedies*, vol. 6: *Birds. Edited with Translation and Notes*, Warminster 1987.
—, *Aristophanes, The Comedies*, vol. 9: *Frogs. Edited with Translation and Notes*, Warminster 1996.
Speigl, Jakob, *Der römische Staat und die Christen. Staat und Kirche von Domitian bis Commodus,* Amsterdam 1970, esp. pp. 144–152 ('Der Vorwurf: Atheismus und Asebeia').
Speyer, Wolfgang, *Fluch*, RAC VII, 1969, coll. 1160–1288.
—, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike. Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, Göttingen 1970 (Hypomnemata 24).
—, *Büchervernichtung und Zensur des Geistes bei Heiden, Juden und Christen*, Stuttgart 1981 (Bibliothek des Buchwesens 7).
—, *Gottesfeind*, RAC XI 1981, coll. 996–1043.
Spoerri, Walter, *Gnome*, KP II, 1967, coll. 823–829.
—, *Diodorea*, MH 48, 1991, pp. 310–319.

Starr, Raymond J., *The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World*, CQ 37, 1987, pp. 213–223.
Stauffer, Ethelbert, *ἄθεος,* ThWNT III, 1938, pp. 120–122 (s.v. *θεός*).
Steckel, Horst, *Demokritos*, RE Suppl. XII, 1970, coll. 191–223.
Steiner, D.T., *Images in Mind. Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton-Oxford 2001.
Steinhausen, Iosephus, *ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ. De grammaticorum veterum studiis ad homines in comoedia attica irrisos pertinentibus*, Diss. Bonn, 1910.
Steinmetz, Peter, *Die Stoa*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, IV: *Die Hellenistische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Basel 1994, pp. 491–716.
Stenger, Jan, *Apophthegma, Gnome und Chrie. Zum Verhältnis dreier literarischer Kleinformen*, "Philologus" 150, 2006, pp. 203–221.
Stern, Jacob, *Palaephatus, On Unbelievable Tales. Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, Wauconda, Illinois 1996.
—, *Rationalizing Myth: Methods and Motives in Palaephatus*, in Buxton, Richard (ed.), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, Oxford 1999, pp. 215–222.
Stoneman, Richard, *The Legacy of Alexander in Ancient Philosophy*, in Roisman, Joseph (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden-Boston 2003, pp. 325–345.
Storey, Ian C., *The Dates of Aristophanes' Clouds II and Eupolis' Baptai: A Reply to E. C. Kopff*, AJPh 114, 1993, pp. 71–84.
—, *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford 2003.
Straten, Folkert van, *Gifts for the Gods*, in Versnel, Hendrik S. (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981 (SGRR 2), pp. 65–151.
Strohmaier, Gotthard, *Ethical Sentences and Anecdotes of Greek Philosophers in Arabic Tradition*, „Correspondance d'Orient" 11, 1971, pp. 463–471, reprint in *idem*, *Von Demokrit bis Dante*, pp. 44–52.
—, *Von Demokrit bis Dante. Die Bewahrung antiken Erbes in der arabischen Kultur*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996 (Olms Studien 43).
—, *Das Gnomologium als Forschungsaufgabe*, in *Dissertatiunculae criticae. Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen*, hrsg. von Collatz, Christian-Friedrich, Dummer, Jürgen, Kolesch, Jutta, Werlitz, Marie-Luise, Würzburg 1998, pp. 461–471, reprint in *idem*, *Hellas im Islam. Studien zur Ikonographie, Wissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte*, Wiesbaden 2003 (Diskurse der Arabistik 6), pp. 43–49.
—, *Die Weisheit des kleinen Mannes. Das Gnomologium – eine ausgestorbene, aber dennoch amüsante Literaturgattung*, in Piccione, Rosa Maria, Perkams, Matthias (ed.), *Selecta colligere, I. Akten des Kolloquiums „Sammeln, Neuordnen, Neues Schaffen. Methoden der Überlieferung von Texten in der Spätantike und in Byzanz" (Jena, 21.–23. November 2002)*, Alessandria 2003 (Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica 11), pp. 3–16.
—, *Doxography*, EI^3 2015–2, pp. 83–87.
Strothmann, Meret, *Asebie und die Athener Jugend im 5. Jh. v. Chr.*, "Tyche" 18, 2003, pp. 167–187.
Stroud, Ronald S., *A Fragment of an Inscribed Bronze Stele from Athens*, "Hesperia" 32, 1963, pp. 138–143.
Sułek, Antoni, *The Experiment of Psammetichus: Fact, Fiction, and Model to Follow*, JHI 50, 1989, pp. 645–651.

Susemihl, Franz, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I–II, Leipzig 1891–1892 (reprint Hildesheim 1965).
Sutton, Diana, *Critias and Atheism*, CQ 75, 1981, pp. 33–38.
Swoboda, Heinrich, *Diopeithes*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 1046–1047.
—, *Beiträge zur griechischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Weimar 1905 (Sonderausgabe aus der "Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte", Bd. 26, Romanistische Abteilung, pp. 149–284).
Tate, Jonathan, *Greek for 'Atheism*, CR 50, 1936, pp. 3–5.
—, *On Plato: Laws X 889CD*, CQ 30, 1936, pp. 48–54.
—, *More Greek for 'Atheism'*, CR 51, 1937, pp. 3–6.
Teegarden, David A., *Death to Tyrants ! Ancient Greek Democracy and the Struggle against Tyranny*, Princeton-Oxford 2014.
Themelis, Petros, Touratsoglou, Joannis, *Οἱ τάφοι του Δερβενίου*, Αθηνα 1997 (English summary pp. 192–224).
Thraede, Klaus, *Euhemerismus*, RAC VI, 1966, coll. 877–890.
Thummer, Erich, *Die Religiosität Pindars*, Innsbruck 1957 (Commentationes Aenipontanae 13).
Todd, Stephen C., *Lysias against Nikomachos: The Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law*, in Faxhall, Lin, Lewis Andrew D.E. (eds), *Greek Law in its Political Setting. Justifications not Justice,* Oxford 1996, pp. 101–131.
—, *Revisiting the Herms and the Mysteries*, in Cairns, Douglas L., Knox, R.A. (eds), *Law, Rhetoric, and Comedy in Classical Athens. Essays in Honour of Douglas M. MacDowell*, Swansea 2004, pp. 87–102.
—, *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11*, Oxford 2007.
Traill, John Stuart, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, vol. 5 (D to Dionysos), Toronto 1996.
Tresp, Alois, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller*, Gießen 1914 (RGVV, Bd. XV 1).
Treu, Max, *Athen und Melos und der Melierdialog des Thukidydes*, "Historia" 2, 1953/54, pp. 253–273 and *Nachtrag* in "Historia 3, 1954/55, pp. 58–59.
Trojahn, Silke, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur Alten Komödie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie*, München-Leipzig 2002 (BzA 175).
Troupeau, Gérard, *Le rôle des syriaques dans la transmission et l'exploitation du patrimoine philosophique et scientific grec*, "Arabica" 38, 1991, pp. 1–10.
Tsantsanoglou, Kyriakos, *The First Columns of the Derveni Papyrus and their Religious Significance*, in Laks, André, Most, Glenn W. (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997, pp. 93–128.
—, *Introduction*, in *The Derveni Papyrus*. *Edited with Introduction and Commentary* by Theokritos Kouremenos, George M. Parássoglou, Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou, Firenze 2006 (Studi e Testi per il Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini 13), pp. 1–19.
—, *Der Papyrus von Derveni*, in HGL II, 2014, pp. 446–452.
Tsantsanoglou, Kyriakos, Parássoglou, George M., *Heraclitus in the Derveni Papyrus*, in Brancacci, Aldo *et al.*, *Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica*, Firenze 1988 (Studi e Testi per il Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini 3), pp. 125–133.
Tsouna McKirahan, Voula, *The Socratic Origins of the Cynics and the Cyrenaics*, in Vander Waerdt, Paul A. (ed.), *The Socratic Movement*, Ithaca-London 1994, pp. 367–391.
Tullius, Friedrich, *Die Quellen des Arnobius im 4., 5. und 6. Buch seiner Schrift Adversus nationes*, Diss. Berlin, Bottrop i. W. 1934.
Turasiewicz, Romuald, *Życie i twórczość Lizjasza. Początki praktyki i teorii retorycznej*, Kraków 1999 (PAU. Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego 71).

Turner, Eric Gardiner, *The Hibeh Papyri*, II, London 1955.
—, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford 1980.
Ullmann, Manfred, *Die Medizin im Islam*, Leiden-Köln 1970 (Handbuch der Orientalistik. Ergänzungsband VI 1).
Untersteiner, Mario, *Senofane. Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Firenze 1956 (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 33) [reprint Firenze 1967].
—, *I sofisti. Seconda edizione riveduta e notevolmente ampliata*, I–II, Milano 1967.
Usteri, Paul, *Ächtung und Verbannung im griechischen Recht*, Diss. Zürich, Berlin 1903.
Vander Waerdt, Paul A., *Socrates in the Clouds*, *idem* (ed.), *The Socratic Movement*, Ithaca-London 1994, pp. 48–86.
Vannicelli, Pietro, *L'esperimento linguistico di Psammetico (Herodot. II 2): c'era una volta il frigio*, in *Frigi e Frigio. Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995*. A cura di Roberto Gusmani, Mirjo Salvini, Pietro Vannicelli, Roma 1997 (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche. Monografie scientifiche. Serie Scienze Umane e Sociali), pp. 201–217.
Veïsse, Anne-Emmanuelle, *L'expression 'ennemi des dieux': theoisin echthros*, in Nuffelen, Peter van (ed.), *Faces of Hellenism. Studies in the History of the Eastern Mediterranean (4th Century B.C. – 5th Century A.D.)*, Leuven-Paris-Walpole, MA 2009 (Studia Hellenistica 48), pp. 169–177.
Vermander, Jean-Marie, *La polémique des Apologistes latins contre les Dieux du paganisme*, "Recherches Augustiniennes" 17, 1982, pp. 3–128.
Versényi, Laszlo, *Socratic Humanism*, New Haven, Conn.-London 1963.
Versnel, Hendrik S., *Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer*, in *idem* (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981 (SGRR 2), pp. 1–64.
—, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion,* I: *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1990 (SGRR 6).
—, *Coping with the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*, Leiden-Boston 2011 (RGRW 173).
Vischer, Rüdiger, *Das einfache Leben. Wort-und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Wertbegriff der antiken Literatur*, Göttingen 1965 (Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 11).
Vollkommer-Glökler, Doris, *Megaloi Theoi*, LIMC VIII 1, 1997, pp. 820–828.
Vossius, Gerardus Joannes, *De historicis Graecis libri IV*. Editio altera priori emendatior et multis partibus auctior, Lugduni Batavorum ²1650 (reprint Lipsiae 1838).
Wachsmuth, Dieter, *ΠΟΜΠΙΜΟΣ Ο ΔΑΙΜΩΝ. Untersuchungen zu den antiken Sakralhandlungen bei Seereisen*, Diss. Berlin 1967.
Waldmann, Günter, *Christlicher Glaube und christliche Glaubenslosigkeit*, Tübingen 1968, esp. pp. 360–367 ('Zum "Atheismus" in der Antike').
Wallace, Robert W., *Private Lives and Public Enemies: Freedom of Thought in Classical Athens*, in Boegehold, Alan L., Scafuro, Adele C. (eds), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, Baltimore-London 1994, pp. 127–155.
Walsh, Joseph J., *On Christian Atheism*, VCh 45, 1991, pp. 255–277.
Walzer, Richard, *Furfūriyūs*, EI² II, 1965, coll. 948–949.
—, *Porphyry and the Arabic Tradition*, in *Porphyre*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1966 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 12), pp. 273–297.
Wartensleben, Gabriele von, *Begriff der griechischen Chreia und Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer Form*, Heidelberg 1901.
Waszink, Jan Hendrik, *Bolos*, RAC II, 1954, coll. 502–508.
Weber, Ernst, *De Dione Chrysostomo Cynicorum sectatore*, "Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie" 10, 1887, pp. 77–268.

Webster, Thomas Bertram Lonsdale, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester 1953 (Manchester 1970).
Wehrli, Fritz, *review of Jacoby 1959*, "Gnomon" 33, 1961, pp. 123–126, reprint in *idem*, *Theoria und Humanitas. Gesammelte Schriften zur antiken Gedankenwelt,* Zürich-München 1972, pp. 162–166.
—, *Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie*, MH 30, 1973, pp. 193–208.
Wehrli, Fritz, Wöhrle, Georg, Zhmud, Leonid, *Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit im Allgemeinen*, in *Grundriss der griechischen Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 3: *Ältere Akademie, Aristoteles, Peripatos*, 2. durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Basel 2004, pp. 493–666.
Weinreich, Otto, *Triskaidekadische Studien. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Zahlen*, Giessen 1916 (RGVV, Bd. XVI 1).
—, *Timotheos*, RE VI A 2, 1937, coll. 1341–1342.
Wellmann, Eduard, *Dardanos*, RE IV 2, 1901, col. 2180.
—, *Diagoras*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 310–311.
Wellmann, Max, *Zu Demokrit*, "Hermes" 61, 1926, pp. 474–475.
—, *Der Physiologos. Eine religionsgeschichtlich-naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*, Leipzig 1931 (Philologus Suppl. XXII 1).
Wendland, Paul, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, Tübingen $^{2-3}$1912 (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament I 2).
West, Martin Litchfield, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1983.
—, *Hocus-Pocus in East and West: Theogony, Ritual, and the Tradition of Esoteric Commentary*, in Laks, André, Most, Glenn W. (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997, pp. 81–90.
West, Stephanie, *Chalcenteric Negligence*, CQ NS 20, 1970, pp. 288–296.
West, William C., *A Bibliography of Scholarship on the Speeches in Thucydides, 1873–1970*, in Stadter, Philip. A. (ed.), *The Speeches in Thucydides. A Collection of Original Studies with a Bibliography*, Chapel Hill 1973, pp. 124–165.
White, John Williams, *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes. With an Introduction on the Origin, Development, Transmission, and Extant Sources of the Old Greek Commentary on His Comedies*, Boston-London 1914.
Whitehead, David, *The Demes of Attica 508/507–ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study*, Princeton 1986.
Whitmarsh, Tim, *Atheistic Aesthetics: The Sisyphus Fragment, Poetics, and the Creativity of Drama*, "Cambridge Classical Journal" 60, 2014, pp. 109–126.
—, *Battling the Gods. Atheism in the Ancient World*, London 2016.
Wiater, Nicolas, *Geschichtsschreibung und Kompilation. Diodors historiographische Arbeitsmethode und seine Vorstellungen von zeitgemäßer Geschichtsschreibung*, RhM 149, 2006, pp. 248–271.
Wifstrand Schiebe, *Marianne, Sinn und Wahrheitsgehalt der Kultbilder aus der Sicht der antiken Philosophie. Zur antiken Debatte an Hand des Beispiels Marcus Terentius Varro*, in *Συγχάρματα. Studies in Honour of Jan Fredrik Kindstrand*, Uppsala 2006 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 21), pp. 189–209.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, Berlin 1893.
—, *Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin 1900 (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse. N.F. IV 3).
—, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*, Berlin 1907.
—, *Der Chor der Wolken des Aristophanes*, SPAW 1921, pp. 738–741, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, IV: *Lesefrüchte und Verwandtes*, Berlin 1962, pp. 553–556 and in Newiger,

Hans-Joachim (Hrsg.), *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie*, Darmstadt 1975 (WdF 265), pp. 170–173.
—, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921 (reprint Darmstadt [4]1984).
—, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I–II, Berlin, 1924 (reprint Dublin-Zürich [3]1973).
—, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I–II, Berlin 1931–1932 (reprint with changed pagination Basel Stuttgart [3]1959).
Will, Wolfgang, *Diodoros, Griechische Weltgeschichte. Buch XI–XIII*, Stuttgart 1998 (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 45).
—, *Der Untergang von Melos*, Bonn 2006.
Willi, Andreas, *The Language of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*, Oxford 2003 (Oxford Classical Monographs).
Wilsdorf, Helmut, *Der weise Achikaros bei Demokrit und Theophrast. Eine Kommunikationsfrage*, "Philologus" 135, 1991, pp. 191–206.
Wilson, Nigel Guy, *A Chapter in the History of Scholia*, CQ NS 17, 1967, pp. 244–256.
—, *Two Notes on Byzantine Scholarship*, GRBS 12, 1971, pp. 557–560.
—, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983.
—, *Scoliasti e commentatori*, SCO 33, 1983, pp. 83–112.
Winiarczyk, Marek, *Ad Athen. Dipnosoph. XIII 92 P. 611 A-B*, "Philologus" 118, 1974, pp. 164–166.
—, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog des Kleitomachos*, "Philologus" 120, 1976, pp. 32–46.
—, *Diagoras von Melos und Diogenes von Sinope*, "Eos" 64, 1976, pp. 177–184.
—, *Starożytne wykazy ateistów. Próba zbadania tradycji*, Wrocław 1977 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis 308, Classica Wratislaviensia 7), pp. 3–92.
—, *Diagoras von Melos – Wahrheit und Legende*, "Eos" 67, 1979, pp. 191–213 and 68, 1980, pp. 51–75.
—, *Theodoros ὁ Ἄθεος*, "Philologus" 125, 1981, pp. 64–94.
—, *Theodoros ὁ Ἄθεος und Diogenes von Sinope*, "Eos" 69, 1981, pp. 37–42.
—, *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?* "Philologus" 128, 1984, pp. 157–183 and 136, 1992, pp. 306–310.
—, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel "Sisyphos",* WSt 100, 1987, pp. 35–45.
—, *Ergänzungen zu Diagoras und Theodoros*, "Philologus" 133, 1989, pp. 151–152
—, *Methodisches zum antiken Atheismus*, RhM 133, 1990, pp. 1–15.
—, *Antike Bezeichnungen der Gottlosigkeit und des Atheismus*, RhM 135, 1992, pp. 216–225.
—, *Bibliographie zum antiken Atheismus 17. Jahrhundert–1990*, Bonn 1994.
—, *Zur Frage der Autorschaft der Schriften des Diogenes von Sinope*, "Eos" 92, 2005, pp. 29–43.
—, *Das Werk* die Erziehung Alexanders *des Onesikritos von Astypalaia (FGrHist 134 F 1–39). Forschungsstand (1832–2005) und Interpretationsversuch*, "Eos" 94, 2007, pp. 197–250.
—, *Die hellenistischen Utopien*, Berlin-Boston 2011 (BzA 293)
—, *The ‚Sacred History' of Euhemerus of Messene*, Berlin-Boston 2013 (BzA 312).
—, *Religionskritik*, RAC 2016 (forthcoming).
Wipprecht, Friedrich, *Zur Entwicklung der rationalistischen Mythendeutung bei den Griechen*, I– II, Tübingen 1902–1908.
Wirth, Gerhard, *Diodor und das Ende des Hellenismus. Mutmaßungen zu einem fast unbekannten Historiker*, Wien 1993 (SÖAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 600).
Witz-Margulies, Bronisława, Диагор Мелосский. Статья, перевод, комментарий, Гродно 1996 (Гродненский Государственный Университет им. Я. Купалы).

Woodbury, Leonard, *The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos*, "Phoenix" 19, 1965, pp. 178–211, reprint in *idem*, *Collected Writings.* Edited by Christopher G. Brown *et al.*, Atlanta, Georgia 1991 (Scholars Press Homage Series 12), pp. 118–150.
—, *review of Guthrie III*, "Phoenix" 24, 1970, pp. 348–356, reprint in *idem*, *Collected Writings* (…), pp. 601–608.
Woodruff, Paul, *Socrates and the New Learning*, in Morrison, Donald R. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, Cambridge 2011, pp. 1–23.
Worth, William, Τατιανοῦ Πρὸς Ἕλληνας. Ἑρμίου Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, Oxoniae 1700.
Wrede, Henning, *Die antike Herme*, Mainz am Rhein 1985 (Trierer Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 1).
Wright, Mary R., *Presocratic Cosmologies*, in Curd, Patricia, Graham Daniel W. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*, Oxford 2008, pp. 413–433.
Wucherer-Huldenfeld, Augustinus Karl, *Phänomen und Bedeutung des gegenwärtigen Atheismus*, in *idem et al.* (Hgg.), *Weltphänomen Atheismus*, Wien 1979, pp. 35–58
Wünsch, Richard, *Der Zauberer Dardanos*, ARW 14, 1911, pp. 319–320.
Wyller, Egil A., *Platons Gesetz gegen die Gottesleugner*, "Hermes" 85, 1957, pp. 292–314.
Wyss, Bernhard, *Doxographie*, RAC IV, 1959, coll. 197–210.
Yunis, Harvey, *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama*, Göttingen 1988 (Hypomnemata 91).
—, *The Debate on Undetected Crime and an Undetected Fragment from Euripides' Sisyphus*, ZPE 75, 1988, pp. 39–46.
Zajonc, Sandra, *Isokrates' Enkomion auf Helena. Ein Kommentar*, Göttingen 2002 (Hypomnemata 139).
Zanetto, Giuseppe, Del Corno, Dario, *Aristofane, Gli Uccelli*, a cura di G. Zanetto. Introduzione e traduzione di D. Del Corno, Milano 1987 (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. Scrittori Greci e Latini).
Zanker, Paul, *Wandel der Hermesgestalt in der Attischen Vasenmalerei*, Bonn 1965 (Antiquitas. Reihe 3. Serie in 4to, Bd. 2).
Zeegers-VanderVorst, Nicole, Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II siècle, Louvain 1972 (Université de Louvain. Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie. 4° série, fasc. 47).
Zeller, Eduard, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung,* II 1, Leipzig ^{5}1922; III 1, Leipzig ^{4}1909 (reprint Darmstadt ^{7}2006).
Zeller, Eduard, Nestle, Wilhelm, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, I 1, Leipzig ^{7}1923; I 2, Leipzig ^{6}1920 (reprint Darmstadt ^{7}2006).
Zhmud, Leonid, *Revising Doxography: Hermann Diels and His Critics,* "Philologus" 145, 2001, pp. 219–243.
—, *Die doxographische Tradition*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, hrsg. von Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer, Georg Rechenauer, Basel 2013, pp. 150–174.
Ziegler, Konrat, *Plutarchos*, RE XXI 1, 1951, coll. 636–962.
Zilioli, Ugo, *The Cyrenaics*, Durham 2012.
Zimmermann, Bernhard, *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen 1992 (Hypomnemata 98).
—, *Aristophanes und die Intellektuellen*, in *Aristophane*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1993 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 38), pp. 255–280.
—, *Parodie dithyrambischer Dichtung in den Komödien des Aristophanes*, in Thiercy, Pascal, Menu, Michel (éd.), *Aristophane: La langue, la scène, la cité*. Actes du colloque de Toulouse 17–19 mars 1994, Bari 1997 ('le Ranae'. Collana di Studi e Testi 20), pp. 87–93.

—, *Das Drama. Einleitung. Ursprungsfragen, Vor- und Frühgeschichte. Organisation*, in HGL I, 2011, pp. 451–474.
—, *Die attische Komödie*, in HGL I, 2011, pp. 671– 800.
Zimmermann, Johann Jakob, *Epistula ad Nic. Nonnen qua Evemerus Messenius et Diagoras Melius ab atheismo contra Plutarchum aliosque defenduntur,* "Museum Historico-Philologico-Theologicum" vol. I, pars 4, Bremae, 1729, pp. 714–760, reprint in *idem*, *Opuscula theologici, historici et philosophici argumenti*, t. II 2, Turici 1759, pp. 1052–1080.
Zschietzschmann, Willy, *Melos*, RE XV 1, 1931, coll. 567–586.
Zuntz, Günther, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*, Cambridge 1965, esp. pp. 272–275 ('The marginal commentary').
—, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri*. Zweite verbesserte Auflage mit einem Nachwort, Berlin ^{2}1975 (The first version of the book appeared in the form of a two-part study in the periodical "Byzantion" 13, 1938, pp. 631–690 and 14, 1939, pp. 545–614).

Indexes

1. Index of names

Abbasids 35
Achilles 93, 147
Adam 36
Aelian 39, 50, 95
Aelius Aristides 100, 105
Aëtius, doxographer 40
Agamemnon 147
Agis, king of Sparta 56 n. 71
Ahikar 89, 89 n. 140
Aiax, son of Oileus 147
Alcibiades 49 n. 39, 54, 55, 56, 57 n. 78, 114, 127, 130
Alexarchus XI
Alexander the Great 35 n. 144, 97, 97 n. 179, 108 n. 230
Alfonso the Wise 36
Ameipsias, comic poet 9, 12
Ammonius, grammarian 31
Anaxagoras of Clazomenae 16, 16 n. 48, 43, 46 n. 22, 49 n. 39, 73, 76 n. 74, 114, 114 n. 249, 119, 119 n. 18, 123, 130, 134, 135
Anaxarchus of Abdera 141
Anaximander of Miletus 118
Anaximenes of Lampsacus, rhetorician 85 n. 117
Andocides 21, 21 n. 74, 23, 49 n. 39, 84
Antigonus II Gonatas 13 n. 38, 108
Antisthenes of Athens 106 n. 217, 110
Antisthenes of Rhodes 89
Apthtonius, rhetorician 29 n. 112
Apion of Alexandria 94, 96, 97
Apollobeches (Apollobex) of Koptos 89, 90
Apollodorus of Athens 14, 15, 27 n. 103, 38, 45
Apollodorus of Tarsus 20
Apollo 99 n. 182, 147, 148
Apuleius of Madaura 95
Archelaus of Athens 122 n. 36
Argonauts 92 n. 159
Arianthes of Argos 24, 48 n. 36, 51, 127
Arimnestus, archon 14
Aristarchus of Samothrace 20, 31
Aristippus of Cyrene 30
Aristogeiton 18
Aristophanes of Athens 1, 4, 5, 8–21, 31–35, 43, 44, 49, 52, 55 n. 70, 57, 59, 76, 77, 79, 81, 111, 119, 119 n. 19, 122, 127, 128
Aristophanes of Byzantium 31 n. 121
Aristotle 30, 40, 46, 50, 58 n. 88, 127
Aristoxenus of Tarentum 24, 25, 50, 51, 74, 79, 79 n. 88, 84, 111, 113 n. 247, 119, 129
Arnobius, apologist 43 n. 7, 97, 97 n. 180, 112, 129
Arrian of Nicomedia 81
Artemidorus of Ephesus 83
Artemis 147
Aspasia 16, 16 n. 48
Athena 147
Athenaeus of Naucratis 47, 56 n. 76, 58 n. 89
Athenagoras of Athens 100, 101, 118, 120, 121

Bacchylides 43, 45, 46
Bias 30, 147
Bion of Borysthenes 30, 107, 107 n. 227, 108, 108 n. 228, 109
Bolos of Mendes 88, 89 n. 137
Büyids 35

Cabeiri 12 n. 35, 58, 103,103 n. 203, 130
Callimachus of Cyrene 10, 32, 82
Callistratus 31 n. 121
Cassandra 147
Caxton, William 37
Cephisius 23
Cercidas of Megalopolis 109
Charias, archon 12–15, 26, 28, 44, 46
Chryses 147
Cicero 63, 64, 91, 112, 113, 128, 129
Cinesias 51, 75, 84, 86, 115, 115 n. 254, 131
Claudius, emperor 100 n. 191
Cleomenes, dithyrambic poet 51
Clement of Alexandria 43 n. 7, 64, 87 n. 123, 97 n. 180, 101, 112, 113, 117, 127
Cleon 16 n. 48
Clitomachus of Carthage 63, 65, 112, 113, 129
Coronis 148
Crantor of Soli 108 n. 228
Craterus 12, 13, 13 n. 38, 15 n. 46, 27, 28, 31, 34, 35, 58

Crates of Athens 107, 108 n. 228
Crates of Thebes 29 n. 112, 108 n. 228
Crateuas 33
Cratinus, comic poet 9
Critias of Athens 64 n. 17, 68, 69 n. 35, 79, 114, 119, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 133
Cronus 133
Cybele 86, 90, 90 n. 148, 91–93
Cyniscus 143
Cyril of Alexandria 37 n. 159

Damascius, Neoplatonist 87, 92
Danaus 147
Dardanus 89, 90
Demeter 65, 125, 149
Democrates 43
Democritus of Abdera 30, 43, 46, 47, 47 n. 26, 48, 69, 76, 87, 88, 88 n. 134, 89, 89 n. 140, 90, 93, 95, 95 n. 172, 98, 114, 130
Democritus of Chios 48
Demonax 30
Demophantes, Athenian politician 18
Demosthenes 30, 149
Diagoras of Eretria 46, 58
Diagoras Terthreus 7, 14
Didymus of Aleksandria "the Blind" 51 n. 51
Didymus Chalcenterus 15 n. 46, 31
Dinon of Colophon 96
Diodorus Siculus IX, 4, 13, 26–28, 34, 44
Diogenes of Apollonia 8 n. 14, 95, 118, 119, 122, 122 n. 36,
Diogenes Laërtius 29, 103, 107, 108 n. 228
Diogenes of Phrygia 95, 134
Diogenes of Oenoanda 48 n. 31
Diogenes of Sinope 36 n. 147, 39, 99, 99 n. 188, 103–111
Dion of Syracuse 30
Dionysius Metathemenos 85 n. 117
Dionysius Scytobrachion 92, 92 n. 159
Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse 115 n. 25, 141
Dionysus 20, 65, 92, 125
Diopeithes 13
Dioscorides 33
The Dioscuri 148
Diotimus, Stoic 110
Drimacus of Chios 56 n. 76
Duris of Samos IX

Egesibulus 46 n. 22
Empedocles of Acragas 43, 45
Ennius VIII, IX
Epeios 99 n. 182
Epicurus 24 n. 89, 40, 66, 79, 79 n. 91, 84, 110 n. 238, 111, 113 n. 247, 119, 124, 124 n. 43, 125, 129, 134, 144
Epigenes 117
Epiphanius of Salamis 112, 129
Eratosthenes of Cyrene 10, 38
Eubulus 46 n. 22
Eucrates 16 n. 48
Eudemus of Rhodes 79 n. 91
Euhemerus of Messene VIII, IX, 96, 96 n. 176, 97, 97 n. 179, 97 n. 180, 133, 134, 135, 136
Euhemerus of Tegea 40
Eumenides 120
Euphronius 31 n. 121
Eupolis, comic poet 10, 11
Euripides 20, 51, 52, 68, 71, 79, 79 n. 92, 85 n. 117, 99, 101, 105 n. 215, 114 n. 249, 128
Eurystheus 101 n. 198
Eusebius of Caesarea 45
Eustathius of Thessaloniki 52 n. 55
Euthyphro 118

Frankfurter, Philipp 101

Al-Ǧaḥiz 40, 41
Galba, emperor 142
Galen of Pergamon 36
Ǧibrīl Ibn Nūḥ 41
Glaucon 118

Harmodius 18
Hecataeus of Abdera 97 n. 179
Hecataeus of Miletus 72, 113, 130
Heliodorus, grammarian 10
Helios 147
Hellanicus of Mytilene 72
Hera IX
Heracles 19, 39, 98–101, 105, 110, 110 n. 240, 130, 141

Heraclides Lembus 46
Heraclides of Pontus 85 n. 117
Heracles Egyptian 87, 90, 91, 93
Heraclitus of Ephesus 45, 71
Hermes 99 n. 182
Hermes Perpheraios 99 n. 182
Hermippus, comic poet 7, 11, 14, 44
Hermogenes 29 n. 112
Herodas 83
Herodorus of Heraclea Pontica 72
Herodotus of Halicarnassus 49, 91, 91 n. 156
Herostratus 134
Hesiodus 72
Hesychius of Alexandria 52 n. 55
Hesychius of Miletus 83, 98, 128
Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse 45 n. 18
Hieronymus, author of Orphic theogony 118
Hippias, tyrant of Athens 18
Hippo 43 n. 7, 97 n. 180, 133–136
Homer 90 n. 145, 118, 120
Huldricus, Jacob 102
Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq 35, 37 n. 159
Hyperbolus, Athenian politician 11

Iacchus 20, 26
Iambulus XI
Ibn Durayd 38–40
Ibn Hindu 39
Ibn an-Nadim 40 n. 175
Isarcus, archon 9
Isis 90 n. 148
Isocrates of Athens 7, 22, 30, 53
Isotimides, Athenian politician 21

John, saint 102
John Chrysostom 50
John Lydus 125 n. 50
Jonah, prophet 103
Julian the Apostate 32, 106

Khnum 91 n. 156
Knuphis 91
Khonsu 91 n. 156

Lactantius IX
Laius 148
Laomedon 92
Leon of Pella 94, 96, 97, 97 n. 179, 135
Leucippus of Abdera 43, 44 n. 7, 76, 76 n. 73, 77
Libanius 32
Lycurgus 50
Lysander of Sparta IX
Lysias 22, 23, 115
Ps.-Lysias 21–23, 84, 113 n. 247, 129
Lysimachus of Alexandria 87, 92, 93
Lysicles 16 n. 48

al-Manṣūr 35 n. 144
Melanippides the Elder 48, 48 n. 35
Melanippides the Younger 48 n. 35
Melanthius, Atthidograph 2 n. 2, 12, 12 n. 37, 13, 14, 15 n. 46, 27, 28, 31, 34, 58
Meletus 69, 70
Melissus of Samos 43
Menoeceus 24 n. 89
Metrocles, Cynic 29 n. 112
Metrodorus of Lampsacus, disciple of Anaxagoras 118
Metrodorus of Lampsacus, disciple of Epicurus 24 n. 89
Mīrhwānd 37
al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik 2, 15, 26, 36–39, 43, 44, 46, 55 n. 70, 78, 78 n. 87, 82, 94, 98, 128
Muhammad 38, 39

Nicagoras of Cyprus 97, 97 n. 180, 135
Nicanor of Cyprus 97 n. 180, 134
Nicias 16, 28, 53, 77
Nicodorus of Mantinea 13 n. 40, 24, 43, 44 n. 13, 46, 48 n. 36, 49–52, 59, 127
Nicolaus 29 n. 112
Nicomachus 56 n. 74
Niobe 147

Odysseus 147
Oedipus 148
Olympias 97
Onesicritus of Astypalaia 108 n. 230, 109
Origen 64
Orpheus 92, 120, 122
Ostanes 90

Palaephatus 73
Panaitios of Rhodes 72 n. 52

Paul the Apostle 64
Peisetairos 18, 19, 55 n. 70
Pericles 16, 16 n. 48, 49, 77
Phaedrus, Epicurean 24 n. 87
Phaeinus, grammarian 31
Pheidippides, son of Strepsiades 8
Phidias 16, 16 n. 48
Philochorus of Athens 13, 45 n. 15
Philocrates, bird-seller 12, 17
Philodemus of Gadara 23–26, 51, 79, 113 n. 247, 117, 119, 124, 129
Philostratus 95
Phocas, saint 99 n. 182
Phoenix of Colophon 109
Phrynichus, comic poet 12
Pindar 43, 45, 46, 75
Pisistratids 12, 18
Pisistratus of Athens 18
Plato 28 n. 110, 37, 50, 62, 66, 69, 71, 74, 79 n. 95, 86, 113, 118, 121, 123, 130
Platter, Thomas 102
Pliny the Elder 90
Plutarch of Cheronea 16, 50 n. 45, 64, 65, 87, 92, 107 n. 227
Ps.-Plutarch 40
Polyaenus, disciple of Epicurus 24 n. 89
Polyaenus, author of *Stratagems of War* 81
Polybius of Megalopolis 50, 127
Porphyry of Tyre 37, 37 n. 160, 38, 78, 94, 98, 128
Posidonius of Apamea 24 n. 89, 110 n. 238
Prodicus of Ceos 64 n. 17, 65, 66, 68, 79, 114, 118, 119, 124, 125, 129, 130, 133, 134
Proserpina 141
Protagoras of Abdera 43, 44 n. 11, 45, 47, 48 n. 31, 49, 73, 80 n. 96, 84, 95, 114 n. 249, 133–135
Protogonus 118
Psammetichus I 91
Ptolemy I Soter 90
Ptolemy II Philadelphus 91
Pythagoras of Samos 50

Qustā ibn Lūqā 40

aš-Šahrazūrī 36, 37
Salmoneus 147
Sarapis 99 n. 182
Sextus Empiricus VII
Shu, Egyptian god 91, 91 n. 156
Simonides of Ceos 39, 43, 45, 46
Socrates of Athens X, 8–11, 30, 34, 43, 49, 50, 69, 76, 109, 111, 114, 114 n. 249, 119, 119 n. 18, 120–123, 130, 141, 142
Socrates of Melos 8, 49, 76, 111, 119, 123
Solomon 90
Solon of Athens 50
Sophocles 85 n. 117
Sosias 134
Spintharus 85 n. 117
Stesimbrotus of Thasus 118, 124, 125 n. 50
Stratonicus 39, 99 n. 186
Strepsiades 8, 9
Symmachus, grammarian 31
Syracosius, Athenian politician 57

Tatian, apologist 79, 94, 94 n. 166, 96, 97, 128
Teisamenus, Athenian politician 56
Telecleides 46, 59, 127
Teleclytus 46, 59, 127
Teles 109
Tertullian, apologist 99, 99 n. 188
Thales of Miletus 37
Themistius 32
Theodoretus of Cyrus 37 n. 159
Theodorus of Cyrene 40, 63–65, 70, 71, 97 n. 180, 106–109, 111, 112, 133–136
Theon 29 n. 112
Theophilus of Antioch 64
Theophrastus of Eresos 89 n. 140, 108
Theopompus of Chios 85 n. 117
Theramenes 29 n. 114
Thespis 85 n. 117
Thestius, king of Aetolia 100 n. 191
Thetis 147
Thrasyllus, grammarian 88
Thrasymachus of Chalcedon 73, 84
Thucydides, historian 19, 53, 53 n. 57
Thucydides, son of Melesias 16 n. 48
Thymoites 87, 92, 93
Tiberius, emperor 88
Timachides of Rhodes 31 n. 121
Timocrates 24 n. 89

Timotheus of Eleusis 90, 91
Triton 149
Tzetzes, Johannes 34, 99

Valesius, Henricus 102

Xanthias 20
Xenocrates of Chalcedon 108 n. 228
Xenophanes of Colophon VII, 51, 67 n. 30, 71, 113, 130, 134
Xenophon of Athens 29 n. 114
Xerxes 18, 95

Yahweh 103

Zaleucus 50
Zeno of Elea 36, 37, 43, 141, 142
Zeno of Citium 24 n. 89, 50
Zeus 8, 11, 44, 67, 139, 140, 142, 143, 147
Zeus Hikesios 147
Zimmermann, Johann Jakob 102
Zoroaster 90

2. Index of geographical and ethnic names

Abdera 95, 95 n. 173
Achaea 55
Achaeans 147
Aegean See 8, 54
Aegina 54 n. 64
Aetolia 100 n. 191
Ainos 99 n. 182
Alexandria 99 n. 182
Arabs 39
Argos 51, 56 n. 71, 127,147
Athenian/Athenians X, 12, 13 n. 39, 15, 15 n. 47, 16, 19, 34, 49 n. 39, 50, 52 n. 56, 53, 53 n. 63, 54 n. 67, 57, 59, 77, 127
Athens VII, X, 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 14–17, 20, 21, 43 n. 6, 44, 46, 48, 49, 49 n. 39, 50–55, 59, 65, 74, 77, 85, 86, 114, 115, 127, 129, 130, 131, 140
Attica 57 n. 81

Baalbek 40
Babylon 88 n. 134
Baghdad 35, 40
Basra 41
Byzantium 32 n. 126
Carthaginians 133
Chaldaea 88
Chalcidice 54 n. 64
Chios 56 n. 76
Cloudcuckooland 12
Corinth 46, 58
Cretans 50
Cyclades 52
Cythera 28

Damascus 36
Derveni 117

Egypt 36, 88, 88 n. 134, 89–91, 92 n. 157
Eleusis 15, 20, 57, 119
Elis 51, 127
Eretria 46
Eretrians 46
Ethiopia 88
Euboea 53 n. 64

Gaza 34
Greece VIII, 18, 53, 68, 74, 89
Greeks 88, 94, 147

Heraclea Pontica 99 n. 182
Heracleopolis 91
Histiaia 53 n. 64

India 88
Italy, South 141

Jews 88, 96 n. 176, 130

Kalenberg 101
Kavala 117
Kerameikos 20 n. 67

Lacedaemonians 50
Lampsacus 124 n. 43
Locri Epizyphyrii 141
Locrians 50

Macedonia 13 n. 38, 97 n. 179
Mantinea 13, 17, 24, 43, 46, 49, 50 n. 45, 51, 52, 59 127, 129
Mantineans 49, 50
Marathon 18
Melian/Melians 15 n. 47, 34, 53, 54
Melos 5, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, 34, 43 n. 7, 44, 46, 47, 52, 52 n. 57, 53, 53 n. 63, 54, 59, 76, 119, 127
Metapontum 43
Miletus 44 n. 7

Nile 88
Nisaea 28
Nysa 92

Oeta 141
Olympia 45 n. 18
Oxford 18
Pelasgians 147

Pella 97 n. 179, 108
Pellene 16, 19,46, 55, 55 n. 70, 56, 56 n. 71, 57–59, 127, 128
Peloponnese 16, 43, 49, 56, 127
Persia 88
Persians 18, 95
Phrygia 78 n. 87, 91, 92 n. 157, 94 n. 169
Phrygians 90, 90 n. 145, 92

Rhegium 43
Rhodes 91
Romans 7

Samos IX, 43
Samothrace 12, 103, 130
Scione 54 n. 64
Sicily 14, 18, 54, 127
Sparta 50, 51, 56, 56 n. 71, 127
Syracuse 45 n. 18, 115 n. 254, 141
Syrian 37

Thebes 148
Thessaloniki 117
Thurii 45
Torone 54 n. 64
Trinacria 147
Trojan/Trojans 90, 90 n. 145, 92
Troy 92, 147

Uranopolis XI

Zurich 102

3. Index of subjects

abandoned by the gods 61, 113, 129
Academy 63, 112, 129
Academic 107, 108 n. 228
accusation of impiety/atheism VIII, X, 16, 21, 24, 24 n. 89, 44, 45, 48, 48 n. 31, 55, 56, 61, 63–65, 72, 75, 84, 94, 106, 110, 111, 113, 113 n. 247, 115, 125, 127, 129
agnosticism 62
agora 20, 20 n. 67, 21, 147, 149
allegoresis, Stoic 117 n. 4
allegorical interpretation 119, 120, 125
allegory, natural 119, 120, 125
altars 149
amnesty 18, 21
anecdote/anecdotes VII, 29, 30, 39, 47 n. 24, 47 n. 26, 65, 75, 76 n. 74, 82, 86, 98–101, 104–107, 110, 110 n. 241, 111, 113, 114, 121, 129, 130
anthologies 29
anthropomorphism 71, 74, 105, 113, 130
apophthegma/apophthegmata 29, 38, 39
asylum 17
atheism VII, XI, 1, 2, 4, 24 n. 89, 25, 34, 45, 61–68, 71–75, 75 n. 68, 76, 80, 82, 83, 85, 109, 111, 113, 114, 129, 130
– definition of 62–63
– origins of 71–74, 113–114, 130
– polytheistic 64
atheist/atheists VII, IX–XI, 2, 15 n. 47, 24 n. 89, 34, 47, 47 n. 29, 52, 58, 59, 61, 63–67, 69, 70, 73–76, 82, 84, 86, 94–96, 102, 105–107, 107 n. 227, 110–114, 123, 125, 128–130
atomism 47 n. 26, 76
Avesta 35 n. 144

belief in gods 66, 69, 74, 82, 85, 105, 110, 113
biographers/biography, Hellenistic VII, 75, 82, 114, 130
blasphemy 25, 115
book/work
– atheistic VII, 25, 63, 65, 74, 78–98, 100, 105, 111–114, 128–130
– Euhemeristic 91, 96 n. 175, 98
burning of a statue 38, 39, 98, 98 n. 182, 99–102, 105, 130
capture of Melos 5, 14, 15, 28, 35, 44, 47, 53, 53 n. 63, 127
catalogue /catalogues of atheists VII, 63, 65, 66, 85, 95, 96, 97 n. 180, 105, 112, 112 n. 245, 128, 129, 133–136
circulation of books in antiquity 11, 49 n. 39, 85
City Dionysia 9, 9 n. 17, 12, 17, 127
codification of laws 56 n. 74
constitution
– democratic 46, 51, 59, 127
– Mantinean 46, 50, 127
Council of the Four Hundred 56 n. 74
criticism of popular religion 65, 71–73, 105
criticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries 49, 54, 55, 59, 65, 77, 78 n. 83, 111 n. 242, 113, 114, 120, 127, 129, 130
cursed people X
Cynic/Cynics 29 n. 112, 104 n. 211, 105–108, 108 n. 228, 108 n. 230, 109, 110, 110 n. 240
Cynic ideals
– internal freedom 108, 109 n. 233
– self-sufficiency 40, 108, 109, 109 n. 233
– simplicity 104 n. 211
Cynicism
– atheistic 107
– hedonistic 107, 109
– rigoristic 107
Cyrenaic/Cyrenaics 65, 109 n. 233

decree
– of Cinesias 115 n. 254
– of Demophantes 18, 18 n. 58
– against Diagoras 12–19, 27, 44, 56, 57, 57 n. 81, 120, 127, 128
– of Diopeithes X, 13, 14 n. 41, 16
– the first fruits (aparchai) 4, 77
– of Isotimides 21
– against Philocrates 12
– of Syracosius 57, 57 n. 78
– of Teisamenus 56 n. 74
– against tyrants 12, 17
deism 63
Delian League 4, 52, 54, 57, 77, 128

desacralisation of myths 73
dithyrambs 48, 59, 127
divination 105
divine punishment 48 n. 30, 58, 69, 75, 102, 105, 114, 130, 147–150
doxographers/doxography 63, 111, 112, 128
druids 88

Eastern wisdom 87–90
Elaphebolion 9, 12
elegy 51
Eleusinion 21 n. 69
encomium/encomia 48, 48 n. 36, 51, 59, 127
enemy of gods 50, 50 n. 46
Epicurean 23, 24 n. 87, 48 n. 31, 51, 112 n. 245, 113, 117, 119, 128, 129
epinikion/epinikia 44 n. 11, 45 n. 18, 48, 48 n. 36, 59, 127
etymology 120
Euhemerism 96, 96 n. 175, 97 n. 180
Euhemeristic ideas 96, 96 n. 175, 97, 128
excerpts 27
existence of gods VII, 24 n. 89, 61–64, 69, 70, 73–75, 86, 95, 105, 107, 111–114, 123, 128–130, 136
extradition 16, 17, 56

florilegium/florilegia 29, 30, 39

Gamelion 20
gnome/gnomes 28, 29
gnomologies
– Arabic 38–40
– Greek 28–30, 101, 103 n. 208
godless 8, 21, 61, 113, 129
gods
– anthropomorphic 105
– Egyptian 94, 96
– Olympian 18, 71–73, 100 n. 191, 113, 130
– pagan VII, 64, 101
good fortune of bad people 74 n. 63, 75, 139–144
gymnosophists 88

heavenly bodies XI, 70, 73
Heraia IX
Hermaia 55
hermokopids 16, 55, 127
hierophants 119
House of Wisdom (Bait al-hikma) 35 n. 144
hybris 147

Iakcheion 20 n. 67, 21 n. 69
images of gods 99 n. 182, 100, 141
immorality of gods 71, 74, 113, 130
impiety VII, 15, 21, 25, 26, 59, 62, 62 n. 8, 76, 77, 129, 147
impiety trials IX, X
impious person/people 49, 74, 76, 77, 79, 86, 102, 104, 111, 127, 139, 143, 147
initiation in the mysteries VII, 22, 55, 120, 121, 129

lawgiver/lawmaker 50, 51, 133
legislation, Mantinean 13 n. 40, 43, 50
Lenaia 20
literature
– Arabic 35–41
– Euhemeristic 97
– Phrygian 87–98
logoi
– Egyptian 87
– Orphic 87
Lysandreia IX

materialism 63
Melian dialogue 53
Melian hunger 18, 19, 53
meteorologists 73
method of work of the ancient scholars 27
miasma 148, 149
misfortune of good people 74 n. 63, 114, 139–144
monotheism 68, 106 n. 217
Mu'tazilites 41
mutilation of the Herms 14, 21, 28, 54, 55, 57, 127
mysteries
– of the Cabeiri 120, 121
– of Cybele 86, 90, 91, 93
– Eleusinian VII, 4, 16, 19–22, 49, 52 n. 56, 54, 77, 118, 121, 121 n. 30, 124, 127, 130
– Orphic 120, 121

natural phenomena 8, 11, 69, 73, 74, 114, 130
Neoplatonist 37, 78, 87, 92, 94

Orphic cosmogony 120
Orphic theogony 117, 119, 120, 122, 125, 128
Orphic poetry 117, 118, 121
ostracism 11, 16 n. 48

paean/paeans 48, 59, 75, 127
pantheism 62
parody of the Eleusinian Mysteries 114, 127, 130
Peace of Nicias 16, 77
People's Assembly 18, 21, 54, 56, 57 n. 76, 120, 127
Peripatetic 24, 79, 79 n. 91, 91, 108, 113, 119, 129
perjurer 75, 76, 82, 140, 143
Persian magi 95, 95 n. 172
philosophy
– atomistic 76
– barbarian 88
– Cynic 107–111
– Eleatic 76
– natural 8, 63, 76, 119, 120, 123
Phrygian school of atheists 95, 96
piety 75 n. 64, 115, 131, 139
plague in Athens 74, 74 n. 63, 114, 130, 140
poet
– dithyrambic 51, 75, 84, 114, 131
– lyric VII, 16, 48, 54, 61, 75
polytheism, atheistic 64
prayer/prayers 105, 106 n. 217
Presocratic philosophers/philosophy 71–74, 85, 117 n. 4, 118, 119, 123, 130
priest/priests
– of Apollo 147
– of Athena 147
– Chaldaean 88
– of Cybele 90 n. 148
– Egyptian 88, 97
– Eleusinian 55 n. 69, 120
– of Isis 90 n. 148
– Orphic 120
procession 20
profanation
– of the Eleusinian Mysteries 14, 16, 28, 49, 55, 57, 57 n. 79, 131
– of the Samothracian (of the Cabeiri) Mysteries 12 n. 35, 118, 120, 121
proof for the existence of gods 69, 69 n. 40
propaganda, Athenian 15 n. 47
providence 73, 75 , 103, 105, 130, 141–144

rationalistic criticism of myths 72, 74, 113, 130,
reliability of Diodorus Siculus 26–28
religion
– Cynic 105 n. 217
– origins of 65, 66, 68, 69, 86
– popular/traditional 65–67, 69–71, 74, 105, 106, 123, 124
religiosity 75 n. 64
ritual purity 148

sacred texts 120
sacrifices 18, 105, 115, 120, 133
sacrilege 55, 143
sail for Sicily 14, 54, 127
sanctuary 20, 103, 103 n. 203, 130
satyr drama 51, 68, 79 n. 94, 128
scepticism 62, 95
scholia/scholion IX, 8, 10, 14, 15, 20, 31–35, 44, 49, 100, 105
school
– Cyrenaic 97 n. 180, 109
– Eleatic 36
– of Socrates 9, 10
– Stoic 24 n. 89
sea catastrophe 48 n. 30, 58, 103, 147, 148
sea voyage 147–150
second version of Aristophanes' *Clouds* 4, 9–11
statue
– of Heracles 38, 98–101, 105, 110, 130
– of Hermes 99 n. 182
– of Sarapis 99 n. 182
stele 87
– of Ahikar 89 n. 140
– bronze 12, 12 n. 36, 57, 57 n. 81, 86
Stoic/Stoics 24, 24 n. 89, 110, 124, 129
supernatural forces 63, 66, 69, 70, 130
sycophant 19, 55 n. 70
syncretism 90 n. 148

talent of silver 12, 44, 56, 56 n. 76, 59, 127
temenos 148

temple/temples 21, 100, 105, 106 n. 217, 140, 141
theology
– pagan 94
– Epicurean 24 n. 89
– Stoic 23
thirtheenth labour of Heracles 100, 100 n. 191
Thirty Tyrants 56 n. 74
tradition
– anecdotal 15, 15 n. 47, 47, 98, 98 n. 181
– Arabic 35–41
– chronological 38
– doxographic 40 n. 174, 63, 65
– Epicurean 48
– gnomological 28–30
travels of Democritus 88, 88 n. 134, 89
trial
– of Andocides 21–23
– of Diagoras 14, 55, 59, 86
– of Protagoras 45 n. 15
tyrant/tyrants 12, 13 n. 40, 17, 18, 45 n. 18, 56 n. 76, 115 n. 254

utopia XI

views, atheistic/impious VII, X, 59, 107
Vortex 8, 44, 49, 119
votive offerings 58, 103, 130

war
– Corinthian 56 n. 71
– Peloponnesian X, 9, 9 n. 19, 13 n. 40, 16, 17, 52, 56, 74, 77, 127, 130
wrath of the gods X, 102, 103, 110, 147, 149

4. Greek and Latin words and expressions

A. Greek words and expressions

ἀγαθὸς δαίμων 115
ἄγαλμα 100, 100 n. 190
ἄθεος VIII, X, 61–64, 76, 112, 113, 129, 130
ἄθεος ἦν τὸ πρότερον 34, 83
ἄθεος πολυθεότης 64
ἀθεότης VIII, 62, 107 n. 227
ἀθεώτατος 64
Αἰγυπτιακοὶ λόγοι 94
ἀναθήματα 103
ἀνδριάς 100, 100 n. 190
ἀπαρχαί 77
ἄπιστα 73
Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι 2–4, 19, 52 n. 55, 78, 80–86, 96, 98, 119 n. 19, 128
ἀποπυργίζω 19, 80–83
ἀποτειχίζω 81
ἀσέβεια 62, 68, 113, 129
ἀσεβεῖν εἰς τοὺς θεούς 62
ἀσεβής X, 62
αὐτάρκεια 109
βουλευτής 115 n. 254
γέγονε 44, 48 n. 34
γογγύλη 100, 104
γραφὴ ἀσεβείας 56
δεισιδαιμονία 107 n. 227
Δῖνος 8, 44, 49, 119
εἰσαγγελία 56
ἐλευθερία 108
εὐεργέτης 66
εὐνομίη 51
εὐτέλεια 104 n. 211
θαυμάσια 73
θεοὶ ἀδελφοί 92 n. 159
θεοῖς ἐχθρός 50
θεομάχος 44, 49
Ἰακχεῖον 20
κακοδαιμονισταί 115
κακὸς δαίμων 115
Καταβάλλοντες λόγοι 80 n. 96, 84
κυνικὸς βίος 108, 109, 109 n. 237
λιμὸς Μήλιος 53 n. 62
λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι 69
λόγῳ – ἔργῳ 22, 22 n. 76
μετέωρα 8 n. 15
μὴ νομίζειν εἶναι θεούς 62
μίασμα X
Νεφελοκοκκυγία 12
νομοθέτης 50 n. 45
νόμος 73 n. 61
νόμῳ–φύσει 22 n. 76, 68, 69, 73
ὁ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποτειχίσας 19, 81
ὄψον 100, 104
ξόανον 100, 100 n. 190
Ὀρφικοὶ λόγοι 93
Ὀρφικὸς λόγος 118–120
παίγνιον 25
παράδοξα 73
παρρησία 109
πολύθεος ἀθεότης 64
πύργος 81
πυργοφόρος 86
τεῖχος 81
τελεστής 121
τερθρεία 7
τερθρεύεσθαι 7
τύχη 69
Ὑπερβάλλοντες λόγοι 84
ὑπομνήματα 31–33, 33 n. 137
φακῆ 100, 104, 104 n. 211, 105 n. 215
φακός 100, 104
φροντιστήριον 9
Φρύγια γράμματα 87, 90–93
Φρυγία ποίησις 87, 92, 92 n. 162, 93
Φρύγιοι λόγοι 3, 5, 19, 78, 86–98, 128
Φρύγιος λόγος 87–89, 93, 98
φύσις 69, 73 n. 61
Χαλδαικὸς λόγος 89
ψήφισμα X, 13, 21

B. Latin words and expressions

contagium X
contra deos testimonium 74 n. 63, 75 n. 69, 139–145
index atheorum 40, 63, 64, 125, 129
index deorum cognominum 91, 91 n. 154
nomina sacra 124
numinosum 63 n. 13
Phrygiae litterae 87, 90, 91, 93
theologia tripertita 72, 72 n. 52

5. Index of passages

Accius, Trag. fr. 142–143 Ribbeck[2–3] 140
Ael. Nat.anim. II 21 92 n. 157
VI 40 43 n. 7, 134
XIII 21 149
Ael. Var. hist. II 22 50 n. 43
II 23 43, 50, 134
II 31 43 n. 7, 95, 134
IV 20 88 n. 134
X 6 115 n. 254
XII 45 92 n. 157
Ael. fr. 33 Hercher = fr. 36 Domingo-Forasté 43 n. 7, 134
fr. 39 = fr. 42 a 24 n. 89
fr. 45 = fr. 48 a 12 n. 35
fr. 45 = fr. 48 b 12 n. 35
Ael. Aristid. Or. 2, 258 Behr (= II 80 Dindorf) 134
Aesch. Eum. 151 61 n. 4
541 61 n. 4
Aesch. Pers. 808 61 n. 4
Aesch. Prom. 336 22 n. 76
Aesch. Septem 602–604 148
Aesch. Suppl. 616–620 147
Aesch. fr. 263–272 Radt (TrGF III 366–370) 90 n. 145
fr. 446 (TrGF III 456) 90 n. 145
Aeschin. Or. 2, 158 149
Aëtius, Plac. phil. I 7, 1 p. 297 Diels 133
I 7, 2 p. 298 68 n. 34
I 7, 1–2 p. 297–298 112 n. 245
I 7, 10 p. 301 142
Ammonius, De adf. voc. diff. 184 12 n. 35
Anaxim. Lamps. FGrHist 72 F 20 a-b 85 n. 117
F 21 85 n. 117
Andoc. De myst. 71 21 n. 72
83 56 n. 74
97 18 n. 58
98 18 n. 58
Andoc. Or. 4, 22 54
Anth. Pal. V 112 (111), 5 25
V 260, 2 (Paul. Silent.) 86 n. 123
IX 412, 7 25
XVI 92, 13–14 100 n. 191
Antiphon, Or. 5, 82 148
Antiphon, Tetr. I 1, 10–11 148
Antisth. Athen. fr. V A 179 Giannantoni (SSR II 206) 106 n. 217
fr. V A 180 (SSR II 207) 106 n. 217
fr. V A 181 (SSR II 207) 106 n. 217
Antisth. Rhod. FGrHist 508 F 12 = fr. 12 Giannattasio Andria 88 n. 134, 89 n. 138
Apion Alex. FGrHist 616 F 18 94 n. 168
Apostolius, Paroemiae VI 4 (CPG II 365) 137
VIII 89 D (CPG II 456) 145
Apul. Apol. 27 8 n. 15, 95 n. 172
90 90 n. 147
Arist. Polit. V 6, 1306 a 46, 58
VI 4, 1318 b 50
Arist. Rhet. II 21, 1394 a 22 29 n. 113
II 21, 1395 a 11 29 n. 113
Arist. fr. 63 Rose = fr. 72 Gigon 47 n. 27
Ps.-Arist. Athen. pol. 16, 10 18, 18 n. 55, 18 n. 59
Ps.-Arist. De virt.et vit. 1251 a 31 62 n. 8
Ps.-Arist. Probl. phys. 924 a 37 80 n. 101
Aristonicus, Περὶ σημείων Iliados, ad II 862 p. 79–80 Friedlaender 90 n. 145
Aristoph. Aves 44 12
186 18
544–545 52 n. 55
1072 17 13 n. 40
1072–1074 12, 15, 19
1072–1075 13 n. 40
1072–1078 12
1073–1074 14, 44
1074–1075 12
1077–1078 12
1372–1409 115 n. 254
1421 19, 55 n. 70
1576 19, 81, 81 n. 106
Aristoph. Eccles. 329–330 115 n. 254
Aristoph. Equ. 1007 104 n. 211
Aristoph. Gerytades, fr. 156 Kassel-Austin (PCG III 2, 102) 115 n. 254
Aristoph. Lys. 619 18 n. 55
630 18 n. 55
Aristoph. Nub. 225 sqq. 122
264 122

366–367 11
368–407 8
398–402 140
518–561 9
553–557 11
826–828 11
827–828 133
828–830 119
828 sqq. 122
830 8, 49, 127, 133
889–1104 9
1024 79 n. 93
1024–1025 52 n. 55, 81 n. 106
1470–1471 11
Aristoph. Plut. 1004 104 n. 211
Aristoph. Ran. 153 115 n. 254
316–459 20
320 20, 26, 44
366 115 n. 254
1437 115 n. 254
Aristoph. Thesmoph. 338–339 18, 18 n. 55
1143 18 n. 55
Aristoph. Vespae 464–465 18 n. 55
487–502 18 n. 55
811 104 n. 211
Aristoph. fr. 696 (PCG III 2, 357–358) 90 n. 145
Aristoxen. fr. 1 Wehrli^{2}
fr. 45 a 24, 119 n. 17
Arnob. Adv. nat. I 52 90 n. 147
II 73 90 n. 144
IV 26 100 n. 191
IV 29 43 n. 7, 97 n. 179, 97 n. 180, 135
V 5 90
Arrian. Anab. II 16, 3 20 n. 65
Arsenius, Violetum p. 148 Walz 147
p. 180 137
p. 201–202 103 n. 204
p. 298 145
Athen. Dipnosoph. IV 44, 156 sqq. 104 n. 211
IV 47, 158 C 104 n. 211
VI 90, 266 CD 56 n. 76
VIII 50, 354 C 47 n. 27
X 5, 413 EF 51 n. 50
X 6, 414 AB 51 n. 49
XII 75, 551 AC 115 n. 254
XII 76, 551 D 115 n. 254
XII 76, 551 EF 115 n. 255
XII 76, 551 F–552 B 115 n. 256
XIII 92, 611 AB 48 n. 30, 58, 58 n. 89
XIII 92, 611 B 110 n. 238
Athenag. Leg. pro Chr. 4 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 104 n. 212, 134
4, 1 118
18 118 n. 14
20 118 n. 14
32 118 n. 14
Athenag. De resurr. 18 143
Aug. Civ. Dei VI 12 72 n. 52
VII 24 87 n. 123
Aug. C. litter. Pet. III 21, 25 (CSEL 52, 182) 47 n. 29, 135

Babrius, Fab. 117, 3–4 149
Bacch. Epin. 3, 21 52 n. 55
11, 109 62 n. 5
Bion Borysth. T 3 Kindstrand 107 n. 227
T 6 A 107 n. 227
T 6 B 107 n. 227
T 19 108 n. 228
T 20 108 n. 228
T 21 108 n. 228
Bolus Mend. DK 68 B 300, 3 89 n. 137

Callim. Hymn. in Cer. 116–117 149
fr. 197 Pfeiffer = fr. 157 Asper 98 n. 182
fr. 454 = fr. 500 10
Cercidas fr. 1 Diehl^{3} = fr. 1 Lomiento 140
Cic. Ad Attic. 342, 2 (= XIII 39) 24 n. 87
Cic. Nat. deor. I 2 63 n. 16, 133
I 29 95 n. 172
I 32 106 n. 217
I 63 133
I 117 63 n. 16, 133
I 117–119 112 n. 245
I 118 66 n. 26, 66 n. 29
I 123 24 n. 89
II 66 125 n. 47
II 76 95 n. 172
III 42 87 n. 128, 91 n. 153
III 53–60 91 n. 154
III 62 125 n. 47
III 79–80 141
III 81 141

III 82 141
III 83 140, 141
III 88 140
III 89 58 n. 91, 102 n. 201, 103 n. 204, 133, 148
Cic. Tusc. disp. I 102 106 n. 221
I 104 106 n. 221
Claudianus, In Rufinum I 12–15 144
Clem. Alex. Protr. II 13, 3 90 n. 144
II 23, 1 64
II 24, 2 43 n. 7, 64, 97 n. 180, 134
II 24, 4 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 104 n. 213
II 33, 4 100 n. 191
VI 68, 5 69 n. 38
VI 71, 2 106 n. 217
Clem. Al. Strom. I 15, 69, 4 88 n. 134, 98 n. 140
I 21, 131, 5 117
V 14, 108, 4 106 n. 217
Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. III 40, 1 143
IX 13, 1 144
Cod. Leid. Voss. 68 p. 29 adn. 2 Beynen 55 n. 70, 102 n. 201, 148
Colum. Res rust. VII 5, 17 89 n. 137
X 358 90 n. 147
Comp. Menandr. et Philist. I 35 Jäkel 144
Corp. Paris. 6, 48 39 n. 168
6, 65 148
Craterus FGrHist 342 F 16 = fr. 16 Erdas 12, 55 n. 69, 56 n. 75, 58 n. 84
Crates Theb. fr. V H 41 Giannantoni (SSR II 539–540) 104 n. 211
fr. V H 72 (SSR II 552) 104 n. 211
Critias DK 88 B 25 = TrGF I, 43 F 19 68 n. 34
Cyr. Alex. C. Iul. I 15 (SCh 322, 134) 43 n. 2
VI 189 (PG 76, 789 B) 47 n. 29
VI 190 (PG 76, 789 C) 12 n. 35

Damascius, Dubit. et sol. de prim. princ. 282 87 n. 131
Demetr. Magnes fr. 29 Mejer 88 n. 134
Democrit. Abd. DK 68 A 1 95 n. 172
A 9 47 n. 27
A 10 a 47 n. 23
A 16 = FGrHist 263 T 3 c 88 n. 134
A 33 88 n. 132
A 75 69 n. 38
B 30 69 n. 38
B 166 69 n. 37
B 299 = FGrHist 263 F 1 88 n. 134, 89 n. 140
B 299 e 87 n. 127, 88 n. 133
B 300, 6 = FGrHist 263 T 4 88 n. 134
B 300, 13 = FGrHist 263 F 2 88 n. 134, 89 n. 142

Diagoras T 1 A Winiarczyk 43 n. 2, 43 n. 5
T 1 B 43 n. 5
T C 43 n. 5
T 2 43 n. 2
T 3 43 n. 5
T 4 43 n. 5
T 5 A 43 n. 1, 43 n. 4, 46 n. 21, 135
T 5 B 43 n. 4, 135
T 6 A 15 n. 47, 34, 39 n. 168, 48 n. 36, 55 n. 69, 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 99 n. 183, 100, 105 n. 214, 136, 139
T 6 B 48 n. 36, 136, 139
7 A 12 n. 35, 14, 35, 44, 55 n. 69, 57 n. 81, 57 n. 84, 136
7 B 12 n. 35
T 8 8, 14, 20, 34, 43 n. 3, 46 n. 22, 48 n. 36, 56 n. 75, 136
T 9 A 43 n. 1, 43 n. 4, 45, 46 n. 22, 47 n. 23, 48 n. 35–36, 58, 75 n. 65, 78 n. 85, 82, 82 n. 110, 136, 139
T 9 B 48 n. 36, 78 n. 85, 137, 139
T 10 36, 43, 44, 55 n. 70, 78 n. 87, 82, 136
T 11 12 n. 35, 39 n. 168, 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 99 n. 183, 100, 105 n. 214, 137, 139
T 12 43 n. 3, 46 n. 22, 137
T 13 43, 50, 134
T 14 50 n. 45, 133
T 15 12, 13 n. 40, 44
T 16 21 n. 71, 113 n. 247, 133
T 17 12 n. 35, 13, 44, 44 n. 11, 133
T 18 A 12 n. 35
T 18 B 12 n. 35
T 19 12 n. 35, 135
T 20 12 n. 35, 47 n. 29
T 21 12 n. 35
T 22 A 58
T 23 135

T 24 135
T 25 55 n. 70
T 26 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 136, 139
T 27 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 100, 101, 104 n. 212, 118, 134
T 28 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 100, 104 n. 213, 112, 129
T 29 39 n. 168, 99 n. 185, 100, 101, 104
T 30 39 n. 168, 99 n. 184, 100, 101
T 31 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 100, 105, 105 n. 214
T 32 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 100, 105 n. 214
T 34 102 n. 201, 148
T 35 A 102 n. 201, 148
T 35 B 102 n. 201, 148
T 36 58 n. 91, 103 n. 204, 121, 133
T 37 58 n. 91, 103 n. 204, 103 n. 205, 121
T 38 113 n. 247, 119, 133
T 39 79 n. 90, 124 n. 43, 129, 133
T 40 63 n. 16, 133
T 41 133
T 42 63 n. 16, 133
T 43 134
T 44 135
T 45 135
T 47 40, 133, 135
T 48 135
T 49 135
T 50 135
T 51 136
T 52 136
T 53 43 n. 7, 133
T 54 134
T 55 134
T 56 134
T 57 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 134, 139
T 58 43 n. 7, 134
T 59 43 n. 7, 134, 136
T 60 43 n. 7, 95, 134
T 61 137
T 62 47 n. 29, 48 n. 31, 112, 129, 134
T 63 39 n. 168, 43 n. 7, 97 n. 180, 99 n. 183, 100, 101, 104 n. 213, 112, 129, 134
T 64 43 n. 7, 97 n. 180, 135
T 66 43 n. 7, 136
T 67 A 78 n. 85, 82 n. 110, 136
T 67 B 35, 78 n. 85, 82 n. 110, 83, 83 n. 144, 136
T 68 46 n. 21, 78 n. 86, 94 n. 168, 96 n. 178
T 69 24 n. 88, 48 n. 36, 79 n. 88, 113 n. 247, 119 n. 17, 129, 133
T 70 51 n. 51
T 73 137
T 74 137
T 76 137
T 78 137
T 79 99 n. 187
T 80 103 n. 208
T 81 103 n. 208
T 82 103 n. 208
T 83 104 n. 208
T 84 55 n. 70
T 85 20
T 86 7 n. 2, 8, 48 n. 36, 136
T 87 A 47 n. 29, 135
T 88 99 n. 188
T 89 46
T 90 46
T 93 87
T 94 87 n. 125
T 95 87 n. 131
T 96 87 n. 130
T 97 87 n. 129
T 98 87 n. 128, 91 n. 153
T 99 52 n. 55
T 100 52 n. 55
T 101 A 12 n. 35
T 101 B 12 n. 35
F 1 24, 48 n. 36, 51 n. 51
F 2 24, 48 n. 36, 50, 52 n. 55
I 1 52 n. 55
I 2 52 n. 55, 79 n. 93
I 3 52 n. 55
I 4 79 n. 89
Didym. Alex. De trinit. III 1 (PG 39, 784–785) 51 n. 51
Diodor. Bibl. hist. III 67, 5 87, 92 n. 160
XII 80, 5 27
XIII 2, 1 26 n. 100
XIII 6, 7 13, 44, 44 n. 11, 133
Diog. Apollon. DK 64 A 3 95
DK 64 C 1–2 122

Diog. Laërt. Vitae phil. I 6–11 88 n. 135
I 17 7 n. 4
I 86 147
II 102 106 n. 221
IV 23 108 n. 228
IV 51–52 108 n. 228
IV 54 107 n. 227
IV 55 107 n. 227
V 50 89 n. 140
V 92 85 n. 117
VI 33 29 n. 112
VI 39 106 n. 217
VI 42 106 n. 217, 106 n. 221, 111
VI 59 58 n. 91, 103, 103 n. 204, 103 n. 205, 106 n. 217, 111
VI 73 106 n. 217
IX 30 44 n. 7
IX 34 95 n. 172
IX 35 88 n. 134, 89 n. 138
IX 45–49 88 n. 132
IX 48 87 n. 127
IX 50 47 n. 26
IX 53 47 n. 27
X 3 110 n. 238
X 3–4 110 n. 238
X 123 24 n. 89
Diog. Oenoand. fr. 16 Smith 47 n. 29, 48 n. 31, 134
Diog. Sinop. fr. V B 103 Giannantoni (SSR II 276) 106 n. 221
V B 105 (SSR II 276) 106 n. 221
V B 334 (SSR II 359) 106 n. 221
V B 335 (SSR II 360) 140
V B 339 (SSR II 361) 106 n. 217
V B 342 (SSR II 362) 103 n. 205, 106 n. 217
V B 350 (SSR II 364) 106 n. 217
V B 353 (SSR II 366) 106 n. 217
V B 412 (SSR II 387) 29 n. 112
V B 415 (SSR II 388) 149
V B 555 (SSR II 435) 106 n. 221
Ps.-Diog.-Sinop. Ep. 25 p. 28 Müseler 106 n. 221
Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II 19, 3 7 n. 5
Dion. Heracl. vel Metathem. SVF I 425 = TrGF II 282 85 n. 117
Dion.Scytobr. fr. 8 Rusten 92 n. 160
Ps.Dion. Telmah. Chron. p. 29 Siegfried-Gelzer 43 n. 5

Ennius, Telamon (Scaen. fr. 316–318 Vahlen = fr. CXXXIV Jocelyn = fr. 117 Manuwald [TrRF II 240–245]) 140
Epicharmus, fr. 33 Kaibel 104 n. 211
Epict. Dissert. I 22, 15 142
I 27, 13 142
III 15, 14 142
III 22, 91 106 n. 221
IV 1, 88 81 n. 103
fr. 13 Schenkl 142
Epicurea, fr. 104, 2 Usener 110 n. 238
fr. 172 47 n. 27
fr. 370 140
Epicurus, Περὶ φύσεως XII fr. 87 Usener = fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti^2 64 n. 17, 79 n. 90, 124 n. 43, 133
Epiph. Anc. 103, 8 (I 124 Holl) 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 104 n. 213
Anc. 106, 6 (I 129 Holl) 100 n. 191
Epiph. De fide 9, 20 (III 506 Holl) 47 n. 29
Etym. Magn. s.v. Διόνυσος col. 277 Gaisford 124 n. 46
s.v. τερθρεία col. 752 7 n. 6
Ps.-Eudocia, Violarium 328 p. 237–238 Flach 137
Euhem. Messen. T 15 Winiarczyk 65 n. 24
T 19 64 n. 23
Eupolis, Marikas, fr. 192–217 (PCG V 399–424) 10 n. 23
Eur. Alc. 339 22 n. 76
Eur. Andr. 1031 52 n. 55
Eur. Autol. fr. 282, Kannicht (TrGF V 344–346) 51 n. 50
Eur. Bacch. 274–285 125
Eur. Belleroph. fr. 286 Kannicht (TrGF V 354) 139
fr. 286, 15 (TrGF V 354) 52 n. 55, 79 n. 92, 81 n. 106
Eur. El. 1354–1355 148
Eur. Hec. 4 90 n. 145
492 90 n. 145
Eur. Hel. 369 90 n. 145
Eur. Herc. 772 52 n. 55
Eur. Hippol. I, fr. 434 Kannicht (TrGF V 469) 139

Eur. Hippol. 1102–1110 139
Eur. Iph. Aul. 1053 90 n. 145
Eur. Orest. 1381 90 n. 145
Eur. Phrixus, fr. 832 Kannicht (TrGF V 873) 139
Eur. Skyrioi, fr. 684 Kannicht (TrGF V 669) 139
Eur. fr. 852, 3–5 Kannicht (TrGF V 887) 148
Eur. fr. 900 Kannicht (TrGF V 910) 139
Eus. Hier. Chron. Ol. 74, 3 (GCS 47, p.109, 3) 43 n. 2, 43 n. 5
Ol. 78, 1 (GCS 47, p. 110, 4) 43 n. 1, 43 n. 4, 46 n. 21, 135
Eus. Chron. versio Arm. p. 191 Karst 43 n. 5, 135
Eus. Praep. ev. III prol. 1 7 n. 4
III 1,1 87 n. 125
VIII 14, 3 144
XIII 13, 35 106 n. 217
XIV 3, 7 47 n. 29
XIV 16, 1 135
Eustath. Comment. ad Hom. Iliad. II 478 (I 394 van der Valk) 52 n. 55
II 862 (I 574) 90 n. 145
Eustath. Comment. ad Hom. Odyss. III 381 (I 134 Stallbaum) 137
XIX 172 (II 197) 50 n. 43
Eustath. Comment. in Dion. Perieg. 530 (GGM II 320) 137
Excerpta Lat. Barb. p. 264 Frick 43 n. 5

Flor. Ἄριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα 38 102 n. 201, 148
Flor. Leid. 179 102 n. 201, 148
180–182 103 n. 208
Flor. Monac. 169 147
190 102 n. 201, 148
191–193 103 n. 208

Galen. De usu part. XII 6 (II 196 Helmreich) 134
Ps.-Galen. Hist. philos. 35 p. 617–618 Diels 136
Gell. Noct. Att. V 3 47 n. 27
GHI I^2 74 77 n. 76
II^2 108 115 n. 254
Gnom. Baroc. 191 104 n. 208
Gnomica Bas. 156 102 n. 201, 148
157 55 n. 70
Gnom. Vat. 148 147
197 149
276 39 n. 168, 99 n. 184, 105 n. 215
384 104 n. 211
Greg. Naz. Poemata mor. 29, 309 (PG 37, col. 907) 150

Harpocr. Lex. s.v. καταπλήξ 23 n. 80
s.v. Κινησίας 115 n. 255
s.v. φαρμακός 23 n. 80
Hdt. Hist. II 2 91, 92 n. 157
II 42, 3 91 n. 156
II 43 91 n. 156
IV 17, 1 104 n. 211
VI 36, 2 81 n. 102
VI 102–108 18
VII 6, 2 18
VIII 52, 2 18
VIII 65, 1–4 20 n. 65
IX 8, 2 81 n. 102
Heraclid. Lembus, De reb. publ. fr. 40 Dilts 46, 58 n. 85
Heraclid. Pont. fr. 13 a Wehrli = fr. 1 Schütrumpf 85 n. 117
Heraclit. Ephes. DK 22 B 5 71 n. 46
B 14 71 n. 46
B 15 71 n. 46
B 127 71 n. 46
B 129 71 n. 46
Herm. In Plat. Phaedr. 267 C schol. p. 239 Couvreur 139
Hermippus, Moirai, fr. 42–50 Kassel-Austin (PCG V 579–584) 7 n. 1
fr. 43 (PCG V 580) 7 n. 2, 44 n. 9
Hermog. Progymn. 3 p. 6 Rabe 29 n. 112
Hes. Op. 25–26 121
240–241 147
Hes. fr. 30, 15–19 Merkelbach-West 147
Hesych. Alex. Lex. s.v. θεός (II 313 Latte) 52 n. 55
s.v. λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (II 599 Latte) 53 n. 62
s.v. τερθρεία (IV 29 Hansen-Cunningham) 7 n. 6
Ps.-Hesych. Mil. De vir. illustr. 13 107 n. 227
17 48 n. 36, 78 n. 85, 137, 139
HGIÜ 123 77 n. 76

Hier. Ep. 39, 2, 3 (CSEL 54, 296) 144
Himerius, Or. 3, 17 144
3, 19
Hippol. Ref. omn. haer. I 13, 1 88 n. 134
Hom. Il. I 8–52 147
I 408–410 147
XVI 384–392 147
XXIV 602–617 147
Hom. Od. III 133–134 147
XII 377–419 147
Hor. Carm. III 2, 26–29 149

Ibn Durayd, Kitāb al-Muğtanā 67 38, 39, 99 n. 186
IG I^3 32 77 n. 81
I^3 78 77 n. 76, 77 n. 81
I^3 95 26 n. 100
I^3 370, 61 26 n. 100
I^3 421–430 12 n. 36
II^2 18 115 n. 254
XI 2, 144 A 84 82 n. 108
Ioh. Chrys. Adv. Iud. Or. 5, 3 (PG 48, 886) 50 n. 47
Ioh. Chrys. In ep. 1 ad Cor. hom. 4, 5 (PG 61, 36–37) 135
Ioh. Georgides, Gnomol. 297 Odorico 103 n. 208
Ioh. Lydus, De mens. IV 71 125 n. 70
Ios. Ant. Iud. VIII 43 90 n. 146
Ios. C. Ap. II 226 12 n. 35
Isocr. Or. 2 (Ad Nicoclem), 44 29 n. 113
Or. 3 (Nicocles), 61 22
Or. 4 (Panegyr.), 100–102 53 n. 61
110 53 n. 61
Or. 5 (Philippus), 6 22
Or. 10 (Enc. Hel.), 4 22
Or. 12 (Panathen.), 63 53 n. 61
89 53 n. 61
Iul. Ap. Caesares 310 B 32 n. 124
Iul. Ap. Ep. ad Basil. 381 A 32 n. 124
Ep. ad Hermog. 374 A 32 n. 124
Ep. ad Them. 260 C 32 n. 124
Iul. Ap. Or. 4 Bidez (Or. 8 Hertlein), 243 C 32 n. 124
Or. 9 Rochefort (Or. 6), 199 B 106 n. 219

Lact. De ira dei 9, 7 135
11, 14 106 n. 217
Lact. Div. inst. I 2, 2 135
I 5, 18 106 n. 217
III 17, 8 140
III 17, 9 144
V 10, 12 144
Leo Pelaeus, FGrHist 659 T 1 94 n. 168
Leucippus DK 67 A 1 44 n. 7
A 8 44 n. 7
A 12 44 n. 7
A 33 44 n. 7
Lib. Apol. Socr. 153 (V 102 Förster) 135
154 (V 103 Förster) 12 n. 35, 135
Lib. Or. 1, 9 32 n. 124
LSCG 5 77 n. 76
Luc. Iupp. conf. 9 143
16 143
17 143
Luc. Iupp. trag. 19–20 143
37 143
Lucan. Phars. VII 445–447 142
Lucret. De rer. nat. II 7–8 79 n. 89
II 606 87 n. 123
II 1101–1104 141
VI 417–420 141
Lys. Or. 6, 17 21 n. 71, 22, 25, 84, 133
6, 24 21 n. 72
6, 51 49 n. 39
9, 14 22
9, 21 22, 22 n. 76
30, 2–4 56 n. 74
Lys. fr. 195 Carey 115 n. 255, 115 n. 256
fr. 196 115 n. 254
Lysimach. Alex. FGrHist 382 F 8 87 n. 130

Marcellinus, Vita Thuc. 32 18 n. 57
Marmor Par. FGrHist 239 A 47 48
Max. Tyr. Dissert. 11, 5 134
Ps.-Maxim. Conf. Loci communes 14, 29/28 p. 354 Ihm 147
Melanthius, FGrHist 326 F 3 12, 57 n. 81, 58 n. 84
Menander, Colax 27–28 140
Epitrepontes 1084–1099 140
Menander, Sent. 338 140
Min. Fel. Oct. 5, 10 143
5, 12 143
8, 2 134
12, 2 143

19, 7 106 n. 217
21, 2 66 n. 26
ML 73 77 n. 76
77, 61 26 n. 100
Al-Mubaššir, Muḫtār al-ḥikam p. 30–31 Rosenthal 36, 43, 44, 55 n. 70, 78 n. 87, 82, 94, 94 n. 169, 136

Novum Testamentum
Ephes. 2, 12 64 n. 19
Mc. 2, 4 80 n. 101
Mt. 5, 22 99 n. 182
18, 9 99 n. 182
Apoc. 9, 20 101 n. 195

OGIS I 218 56 n. 76
Olymp. In Plat. Gorg. 17, 2 p. 97 Westerink 144
Orig. C. Cels. I 1 64 n. 22
Orig. Exhort. ad mart. 32 64 n. 21
Orphica T 57 Kern 118 n. 14
T 58 118 n. 14
T 59 118 n. 14
Orphica T 470 Bernabé 121
T 671 87 n. 125
Ovid. Amor. III 3, 1–2 141
III 9, 35–36 141
Ovid. Fasti IV 219 87 n. 123
Ovid. Metam. IX 203–204 141
X 696 87 n. 123

Paus. IX 27, 7 100 n. 191
PDerv. col. VI 120
col. XVIII 1 123 n. 40
col. XX 120, 121, 121 n. 30
Petron. Satyr. 105, 1 149
PGM I 126 90 n. 147
II 66 89 n. 141
Pherecrates, fr. 155 Kassel-Austin (PCG VII 180) 115 n. 254
Philo Alex. De prov. I 37 141
II 3 141
Philo Alex. Quod deter. pot. insid. sol. 34 141
Philochorus, FGrHist 328 F 134 26 n. 100
Philod. De piet. pars I, 19, 519–541 Obbink 119, 124 n. 43
19, 523–530 79 n. 90
19, 523–536 64 n. 17, 133
19, 533–535 124
Philod. De piet. (PHerc. 1428), col. II 28 – III 13 Henrichs 66 n. 26
col. VIII 9–11 125 n. 47
col. IX 27–29 125 n. 47
col. XI–XII 12 79 n. 88, 119 n. 17, 133
col. XI 5–7 24 n. 88
col. XI 10–11 25
col. XI 25–34 48 n. 36
col. XII 1–2 48 n. 36
col. XV 20–21 24 n. 87
Philod. De piet. (PHerc. 1428 E c) 7 a, 3–8 Gomperz = p. 115 Schober 106 n. 217
Philod. PHerc. 1021 (= Acad. phil. ind. Herc.), col. XVI (S 30) p. 150 Dorandi 108 n. 228
Philod. De stoicis (PHerc. 155 et 339), col. XI 10–11 Dorandi 24 n. 89
col. XII 16–18 24 n. 89
Philod. Epigr. 20 p. 362 Gow-Page 25 n. 96
Philostr. Vita Apoll. VIII 5 (I 300 Kayser) 150
Philostr. Vita soph. I 10 (II 13 Kayser) 95 n. 173
Phot. Bibl. 243 p. 357 a 23–25 (VI 67–68) 144
243 p. 357 b 11–12 (VI 68 Henry) 144
Phot. Lex. s.v. λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (II 508 Theodoridis) 53 n. 62
τερθρεία (III 459) 7 n. 6–7
Pind. Nem. 10, 44 55 n. 70
Pind. Ol. 9, 97–98 55 n. 70
Pind. Pyth. 2, 49–50 52 n. 55
3, 35–37 148
4, 162 62 n. 5
Pl. Apol. 18 BC 8 n. 15
26 C 62, 69, 113, 130
26 DE 49 n. 39
Pl. Leg. VII 821 A 8 n. 15
IX 868 AB 148
IX 871 A 149
X 886 D 73
X 886 DE 69 n. 39
X 889 AC 69 n. 39
X 889 BC 73 n. 59
X 889 E 66 n. 28, 69
X 890 A 69
X 891 B–899 D 69 n. 40
X 891 C 73 n. 59
X 910 B 149

XII 967 A 8 n. 15
XII 967 C 73
Pl. Meno 81 A 121 n. 33
Pl. Phaedo 97 B–98 B 119 n. 18, 123
Pl. Phaedr. 245 C–246 A 69 n. 40
267 C 28 n. 110
Pl. Comicus fr. 200 Kassel-Austin (PCG VII 518) 115 n. 254
Plin. Nat. hist. XXV 13 88 n. 134
XXX 9 88 n. 134, 89 n. 142
Plut. Alcib. 16, 6 54
22, 4 49 n. 39
Plut. An vitios. ad infel. suff. 3, 499 D 106 n. 221
Plut. De aud. poet. 4, 21 EF 106 n. 217
Plut. De comm. not. 31, 1075 A 43 n. 7, 133
Plut. De Daedalis Plat. fr. 157 Sandbach 87 n. 125
Plut. De def. orac. 10, 415 A 87
Plut. De Is. et Os. 23, 360 A 65 n. 24
29, 362 B 87 n. 129
Pl. De stoic. rep. 37, 1051 CD 142
Plut. De superst. 13, 171 BC 133
13, 171 C 50 n. 45
Plut. De tuenda san. praec. 7, 125 F 104 n. 211
Plut. Nic. 23, 3–4 8 n. 15
Plut. Per. 32, 2 13 n. 41
Plut. Phoc. 28, 2 20 n. 65
Plut. Quaest. conv. I 2, 3, 616 D 84 n. 115
Ps.-Plut. De mus. 30, 1141 EF 115 n. 254
Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. 880 D 40
880 DF 112 n. 245
880 EF 68 n. 34
881 D 142
Ps.-Plut. Kitāb al-ārāʾ al-ṭabīʿya I 7, p. 114–115 Daiber 40, 134
Pollux, Onomast. X 97 12 n. 36, 57 n. 81, 58 n. 83
Polyaen. Strat. I 3, 5 81 n. 103
Polyb. Hist. VI 43, 1 50
XXXVI 9, 15 62 n. 8
Posid. fr. 22 a Edelstein-Kidd = fr. 346 Theiler 24 n. 89
fr. 288 = fr. 290 b 110 n. 238
POxy 2258 32, 32 n. 131, 33
Propert. El. III 17, 35 87 n. 123
Protag. Abd. DK 80 A 1 47 n. 26, 47 n. 27
A 2 95 n. 173
B 1 84 n. 115
B 4 73

Quint. Inst. orat. VI, praef. 4–9 142
VIII 5, 3 29 n. 113

Rufin. Hist. eccl. VI 23 99 n. 182

Schol. Ael. Aristid. ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 258 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 105 n. 214
Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I 558 p. 48 Wendel 87 n. 130
I 936–49 f. p. 81–82 90 n. 145
Schol. Aristoph. Aves 186 53 n. 62
766 26 n. 100
1073 12 n. 35, 14, 14 n. 43–44, 15, 35, 44, 55 n. 69, 57 n. 81, 58 n. 84, 136
Schol. Arist. Nub. 520 10
553 10
830 15, 105 n. 215, 136
830 b 34, 139
830 c 48 n. 36, 55 n. 69
830 f 75 n. 67, 139
830 g 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 105 n. 214
1115 10
Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 179 26 n. 100
Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 320 8, 12 n. 35, 14, 34, 43 n. 3, 48 n. 36, 56 n. 136, 75
Schol. Clem. Alex. Protr. II 24, 2 (I 304 Stählin) 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 136, 139
Schol. Eur. Hec. 4 (I 12 Schwartz) 90 n. 145
Schol. A Hom. Iliad. II 862 (I 348–349 Erbse) 90 n. 145
Sen. Apocol. 5 100 n. 191
Sen. Consol. ad Marciam 12, 6 142
Sen. De tranqu. anim. 14, 3 106 n. 221
Sen. Ep. 74, 10 142
Serv. Comment. Verg. Aen. I 182 (I 73 Thilo) 90 n. 145
Sext. Emp. Adv. math. II 22 7 n. 3
VII 60 84 n. 115
VII 110 VII
IX 18 66 n. 26
IX 19 69 n. 37
IX 24 69 n. 38
IX 50–53 134
IX 50–58 112 n. 245
IX 52 66 n. 26

IX 53 48 n. 36, 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 139
IX 54 68 n. 34
IX 55 47 n. 29
Sext. Emp. Pyrrh. hyp. I 32 143
III 218 134
SIG I^{3} 128 115 n. 254
Simplic. In Arist. De caelo I 3 p. 116 (CAG 7, p.116, 22–26) 43 n. 7, 136
Simplic. In Epict. enchir. 38 p. 368 Hadot 144
Solon, fr. 38, 3 West 104 n. 211
Soph. Ant. 370–375 148
Soph. El. 124 61 n. 4
1181 61 n. 4
Soph. Oed. rex 95–146 148
236–275 148
661 62 n. 5
1360 61 n. 4
Soph. Trach. 1036 61 n. 4
Soph. fr. 366 Radt (TrGF IV 328) 90 n. 145
Spintharus, 40 T 3 (TrGF II 168–169) 85 n. 117
Stesimbrotus, FGrHist 107 F 13 124 n. 46
Stob. Anth. I 3, 50 (I 61–62 Wachsmuth) 142
IV 10, 1.6 (IV 327–330 Hense) 51 n. 50
IV 42, 7 (V 951–952 Hense) 139
IV 55, 11 (V 1119 Hense) 106 n. 221
Str. Geogr. VIII 3, 30 p. 353 80 n. 101
Strattis, Cinesias, fr. 14–22 Kassel-Austin (PCG VII 631–634) 115 n. 254
fr. 17 (= PMG 775) 115 n. 255
Suda, Lex. s.v. ἀναδεῖ (I 166 Adler) 12 n. 35
Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους (I 315) 78 n. 85, 82 n. 110, 136
Ἀριστόξενος (I 357) 24 n. 90
Δημόκριτος (II 44) 88 n. 134
Διαγόρας 523 (II 53) 43 n. 1, 43 n. 4, 45, 46 n. 22, 47 n. 23, 48 n. 35–36, 58, 75 n. 65, 78 n. 85, 82, 82 n. 110, 136, 139
Διαγόρας 524 (II 53) 136
ἐξεφοίτα (II 309) 12 n. 35
Ἐπίκουρος (II 363) 24 n. 89
ἔρρε (II 404) 43 n. 7, 136
Ἴακχος (II 602) 20 n. 65, 48 n. 36, 136
Κινησίας (III 119) 115 n. 255
λιμῷ Μηλίῳ (III 272) 53 n. 62
Μελανιππίδης (III 350) 48 n. 34
Πελληναῖος χιτών (IV 81) 55 n. 70
πυργίσκοι (IV 274) 35, 78 n. 85, 82 n. 110, 83, 83 n. 114, 136
Σωκράτης (IV 405) 48 n. 36, 136, 139
τερθρεία (IV 526) 7 n. 6–7
Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων s.v. τερθρεία p. 467 Cunningham 7 n. 6
Syncell. Ecl. chronogr. 483 p. 305 Mosshammer 43 n. 5

Tat. Or. ad Graec. 21, 3 100 n. 191
27 46 n. 21, 78 n. 86, 94, 94 n. 168, 96 n. 178
Tert. Ad nat. I 10, 43 99 n. 148
Tert. Apolog. 14, 9 99 n. 148
Tert. De anima 57 90 n. 147
Themistius, Σοφιστής 289 C (II 83 Downey-Norman) 32 n. 124
Theodor. Cyr. T 8 Winiarczyk = IV H 8 Giannantoni (SSR II 121) 106 n. 221
T 9 = IV H 8 (SSR II 121) 106 n. 221
T 10 = IV H 8 (SSR II 121) 106 n. 221
T 11 = IV H 8 (SSR II 121) 106 n. 221
T 15 = IV H 13 (SSR II 126) 106 n. 221
T 16 = IV H 5 (SSR II 120) 106 n. 221
T 53 = IV H 28 (SSR II 132) 107 n. 227
Theodoret. Graec. affect. cur. praef. 9 135
I 75 106 n. 217
II 112 135
III 4 135
VI 6 136
Theognis, El. 377–380 139
743–752 139
Theoph. Ant. Ad Autol. III 7 47 n. 29
III 7, 6 64 n. 23
III 7, 7 64 n. 17
Theophr. Acicharus, fr. 1 = fr. 727, 13 Fortenbaugh *et al.* 89 n. 140
Theophr. Charact. 25, 2 149
Theophr. De caus. plant. V 6, 5 80 n. 101
Theos. Tub. 70 39 n. 168, 99 n. 185, 104
Thrasymachus Chalc., DK 85 B 7 84 n. 115
B 8 73, 139
Thuc. Bell. Pelop. I 64, 1 81 n. 102
I 65, 1 81 n. 103
I 114, 3 53 n. 64
I 134, 2 80
II 9, 2 56 n. 71
II 27, 1 54 n. 64

II 53 140
II 53, 4 74 n. 63
III 91, 1–2 28
IV 130, 7 81 n. 102
V 3, 4 54 n. 64
V 32, 1 54 n. 64
V 58, 4 56 n. 71
V 84–116 53 n. 59
V 114, 1 19
V 115, 1 19
V 116, 2 19
V 116, 4 53
VI 27–28 55
VI 53, 3 18 n. 55
VI 60 55
VI 60, 1 18 n. 55
VI 60, 4 56 n. 76
VI 61, 7 56 n. 72
VII 73, 1 80
VIII 3, 2 56 n. 71
VIII 97, 2 56 n. 74
Trag. Graec. inc., fr. 1 b (g), lin. 15–24 Snell-Kannicht (TrGF II 5–6) 139
fr. 465 (TrGF II 137) 139
Tyrtaeus, El. 12 (II 177–179 West) 51 n. 50
Tzetzes, Chil. II 36 100 n. 191
503 100 n. 191
505 100 n. 191
XIII 374–384 39 n. 168, 99 n. 183, 105 n. 214
XIII 375 137
Tzetzes, Comment. Aristoph. Nub. 829 a 39 n. 168, 75 n. 66, 75 n. 67, 99 n. 183, 105 n. 214, 137, 139
830 a 137
Tzetzes, Comment. Aristoph. Ran. 320 a 12 n. 35, 46 n. 22, 137
320 b 137
Tzetzes, Epist. 104 p. 152 Leone 99 n. 187

Val. Max. Facta et dicta memor. VI 2 ext. 3 106 n. 221
Varro, Ant. rer. div. fr. 6 Cardauns 72 n. 52
fr. 267 86 n. 123
Ps.-Varro, Epigramma, p. 265 Riese 141
Verg. Aen. VI 784–785 87 n. 123
Vetus Testamentum
Bar. (Ep. Jer.) 6 101 n. 195
Dan. 5, 23 101 n. 195
14, 1–22 101 n. 195
Habac. 2, 18–19 101 n. 195
Is. 44, 9–20 101 n. 195
Jer. 10, 3–15 101 n. 195
12, 1–3 145
Job 21, 7–16 145
Prov. 24, 19–20 145
Ps. 37 (36) 145
49 (48) 145
73 (72) 145
115 (113 B), 4–7 101 n. 195
135 (134), 15–17 101 n. 195
1 Reg. 5, 11 (Hebrew version) 90 n. 146
3 Reg. 5, 11 90 n. 46
Sap. 13, 10–14 101 n. 195
13, 21 101 n. 195
Vita S. Phocae 3–7 99 n. 182
7 99 n. 182

Xen. Cyrop. VIII 1, 25 148
Xen. Hell. I 3, 4 81 n. 102
II 2, 3 53
II 3, 56 29 n. 114
IV 2, 20 56 n. 71
Xen. Hieron 4, 4 148
Xen. Memor. I 4, 6 82 n. 108
IV 2, 9 29 n. 113
Xenoph. DK 21 B 2 = fr. 2 West (II 186–187) 51 n. 49
B 11 71 n. 45
B 12 71 n. 45
B 14 71 n. 45
B 15 71 n. 45
B 16 71 n. 45
B 34 VII n. 1
C 2 51 n. 50

Zenobius IV 94 (CPG I 113) 53 n. 62
Ps.-Zonaras, Lexicon s.v. ἐξεφοίτα 12 n. 35